DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 210 709 CS 206 699

AUTHOR Witte, Stephen P.; And Others
TITLE A National Survey of College and University Writing Program Directors. Technical Report Number 2.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin.
SPONS AGENCY Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 31 Aug 81
GRANT G008005896
NOTE 135p.; Prepared through the Writing Program Assessment Project.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College English; Curriculum Evaluation; *Curriculum Research; *English Curriculum; Evaluation Criteria; Higher Education; National Surveys; *Writing (Composition); Writing Research
IDENTIFIERS *Freshman Composition; Writing Program Assessment Project; *Writing Programs

ABSTRACT

This report presents the results of a national survey of college and university writing program directors that was undertaken to provide reliable and current information about writing programs at the college level. The first chapter contains a discussion of the survey questionnaire and sample population. The next nine chapters report the responses of the 127 subjects surveyed in the following areas: (1) required and elective writing courses; (2) types, distributions, and sizes of writing courses; (3) staffing of writing courses; (4) proficiency examinations and exemption practices; (5) freshman textbooks used; (6) activities in freshman writing courses; (7) evaluating freshman writing students; (8) faculty evaluation and development; and (9) successful and unsuccessful aspects of college writing programs. A concluding chapter contains criticism and praise of the questionnaire used in the survey and a discussion of the aspects of writing programs not covered by the survey. A list of participating universities and colleges is appended. (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED210709

WRITING PROGRAM ASSESSMENT PROJECT
Technical Report Number 2

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

A NATIONAL SURVEY OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY WRITING PROGRAM DIRECTORS

Stephen P. Witte
Paul R. Meyer
Thomas P. Miller
Lester Faigley

Jointly Funded by The Fund for The Improvement of Post-Secondary Education and The University of Texas

CS206699

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 2

FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
GRANT NO. G008005896

A NATIONAL SURVEY OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY WRITING PROGRAM DIRECTORS

Stephen P. Witte
Paul R. Meyer, Thomas P. Miller
and Lester Faigley

Writing Program Assessment Project
GRG 106-A
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas 78712

August 31, 1981

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, with supplemental support from The University of Texas at Austin. The opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect positions or policies of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education or The University of Texas at Austin

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS 1

Chapter I: THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND THE SAMPLE POPULATION 1

I.1. INTRODUCTION 1

I.2. SAMPLE SELECTION AND RESPONSE RATE 3

I.3. DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE POPULATION: SCHOOLS AND WRITING PROGRAM DIRECTORS 4

I.3.1. Sample Distribution Across Types of Institutions . 5

I.3.2. Sample Distribution Across Size Categories 6

I.4. EXTRAPOLATING TO THE NATIONAL POPULATION 9

I.5. EXTRAPOLATING BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE AND ENROLLMENT . 10

Chapter II: REQUIRED AND ELECTIVE WRITING COURSES 13

II.1. NUMBERS AND LEVELS OF REQUIRED WRITING COURSES . . . 13

II.2. NUMBERS AND LEVELS OF ELECTIVE WRITING COURSES . . . 15

II.3. WRITING COURSES IN "OTHER" DEPARTMENTS OR COLLEGES . 16

Chapter III: TYPES, DISTRIBUTIONS, & SIZES OF WRITING COURSES 19

III.1. TYPES AND DISTRIBUTIONS OF WRITING COURSES IN RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS 19

III.1.1. Types and Distribution of Writing Courses: Two-Year Colleges 19

III.1.2. Types and Distribution of Writing Courses: Four-Year Institutions 21

III.1.3. Types and Distribution of Writing Courses: Universities 26

III.2. TYPES AND DISTRIBUTION OF WRITING COURSES: ALL SCHOOLS 30

III.3. A NATIONAL PROJECTION OF TYPES AND DISTRIBUTION OF WRITING COURSES 32

III.3.1. National Projections for Introductory and Non-Introductory Courses by Institutional Type . . 32

III.3.2. National Projections of Course Types for Types of Institutions 34

III.4. AVERAGE SIZES OF WRITING CLASSES 37

III.5. WRITING COURSES AND SYLLABI 41

Chapter IV: STAFFING OF WRITING COURSES 43

IV.1. STAFFING OF INTRODUCTORY COURSES 43

IV.2. STAFFING OF NON-INTRODUCTORY COURSES 47

IV.3. SUMMARY OF STAFFING ACROSS CURRICULAR LEVELS 50

IV.4. SUMMARY OF STAFFING ACROSS LEVELS AND INSTITUTIONAL TYPES 51

IV.5. STAFFING WRITING COURSES: A NATIONAL PROJECTION . . 53

Chapter V: PROFICIENCY EXAMINATIONS AND EXEMPTION PRACTICES . 55

V.1. PROFICIENCY EXAMINATIONS 55

V.2. EXEMPTION PRACTICES 55

Chapter VI: FRESHMAN TEXTBOOKS 57

VI.1. FRESHMAN TEXTBOOK USE: ALL RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS . 57

VI.1.1. Use in First-Semester/Quarter Courses: All Schools 58

VI.1.2. Use in Second-Semester/Quarter Courses: All Schools 59

VI.2. TEXTBOOK USE BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE IN FIRST-SEMESTER/QUARTER COURSES 60

VI.3. TEXTBOOK USE BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE IN SECOND-SEMESTER/QUARTER COURSES 62

Chapter VII: ACTIVITIES IN FRESHMAN WRITING COURSES 67

VII.1. SURVEY OF INSTRUCTIONAL AND CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES . 67

VII.2. SURVEY OF ESSAY WRITING 71

VII.2.1. Total Number of Pages Written 71

VII.2.2. Total Number of "Papers" Written: Purposes and Method(s) of Development 73

VII.2.2.a. First-Semester/Quarter Courses 74

VII.2.2.b. Second-Semester/Quarter Courses 76

Chapter VIII: EVALUATING STUDENTS IN FRESHMAN WRITING COURSES 79

VIII.1. EVALUATION IN FIRST-SEMESTER/QUARTER FRESHMAN WRITING COURSES 79

VIII.2. EVALUATION IN SECOND-SEMESTER/QUARTER FRESHMAN WRITING COURSES 81

Chpater IX: FACULTY EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENT 83

IX.1. FACULTY EVALUATION 83

IX.1.1. Sources of Evaluation Data for Four Classes of Faculty 83

IX.1.2. Sources of Data for Evaluating Graduate Teaching Assistants 85

IX.2. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT 87

IX.2.1. In-Service Professional Development Workshops 87

IX.2.2. Frequency of In-Service Workshops 89

IX.2.3. Use of "Consultants" in In-Service Workshops . 89

IX.2.4. Training of Graduate-Student Teachers of Writing 90

IX.2.5. Travel Funds for Faculty Development 90

IX.3. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHING EVALUATION AND FACULTY DEVELOPMENT 92

Chapter X: SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL ASPECTS OF COLLEGE WRITING PROGRAMS 95

X.1. SUCCESSFUL ASPECTS OF COLLEGE WRITING PROGRAMS . . . 96

X.2. UNSUCCESSFUL ASPECTS OF COLLEGE WRITING PROGRAMS . . 104

Chapter XI: A CONCLUDING STATEMENT 111

X.1. CRITICISM OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE 112

X.2. PRAISE OF THE QUAESTIONNAIRE 116

X.3. ASPECTS OF WRITING PROGRAMS NOT COVERED BY THE PRESENT SURVEY 119

X.4. A MAJOR CONCLUSION 119

NOTES 125

APPENDIX: PARTICIPATING UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES 129

CHAPTER I

THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND THE SAMPLE POPULATION

I. 1. INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of a national survey of college and university writing program directors (see note 1). The survey was undertaken to provide the profession at large with reliable and current information about college and university writing programs. The report relies heavily on descriptive statistics. We undertook the survey of writing program directors in order to describe college-level writing programs; we did not undertake the survey in order to test hypotheses. Hypothesis-testing assumes a level of background knowledge and theory which we believe does not exist for writing programs.

When we began our study, we realized that our report might seem to be presenting statistics on the average height, weight, and age of people in Switzerland when photographs of the Jungfrau, Lake Geneva, and the Rhone River might be of more interest. But we also felt that for at least two reasons such photographs would be of limited value to persons interested in college writing programs. First, such collections of photographs already exist in the form of descriptions of freshman writing programs, descriptions such as those recently collected by Jasper Neel (see note 2) and by Harvey Wiener and Elaine Maimon (see note 3). Second and more important, national trends can not be identified in the anecdotal evidence provided in those descriptions. Too often in the past, single examples have been held up as "typical" while far more numerous opposing examples have been ignored. We did not quantify because of our love for numbers nor to level out differences across institutions. Indeed, we chose to do a national survey because we did not want to elevate a few programs as ideals while ignoring what the great majority of colleges and universities in this country actually do to teach writing.

The report which follows is a detailed one, monotonously and painfully so in places. But it is detailed for what we think are very good reasons. The report describes a large number of data about a large number of aspects of a large number of college-level writing programs. Some of these data we have found to be meaningful, to be explainable. What significance other data have remains unclear to us. But those same data may be meaningful to others. Our inability to see any significance in

certain pieces of data was no reason to exclude those data from the report. If we have erred, we have purposefully erred in the direction of inclusiveness. It would have been easier to have written--in very "upbeat" language, of course--a report which merely offered what we think are the major findings of the survey. We could have eliminated the problem of dealing with many numbers that way and saved ourselves much time. However, if we learned anything from the writing program directors we surveyed, it was that there are many ways of viewing similar things; and we expect that some of the data we summarize in this report will be interpreted differently by different people. In fact, we hope that will be the case and that meaningful discussions about the nature of college writing programs ensue from these interpretations. We have chosen to present the results of our survey in such a way that those results can be interpreted by others in addition to ourselves. We certainly offer our interpretations in the pages which follow. But we invite others to supplement, and even correct, our interpretations when necessary.

Some valuable surveys of writing programs have appeared from time to time. However, it is the nature of survey data to become quickly obsolete, especially as attitudes toward the teaching of writing change rapidly and as many institutions of higher learning build new and different writing components into their curricula. What was generally true of college-level writing programs in, say, 1960 or even 1978 may no longer be true. Instructional methods such as sentence combining were just beginning to have an impact on college writing programs in 1978; and writers of college textbooks and college writing teachers themselves may now have a better understanding of the processes of composing than they did only three years ago. Our survey of writing program directors is the latest testing of the waters, the most recent pulse-taking of a discipline in flux. To the extent, then, that college writing programs have changed and are changing, studies like this one may be helpful to those trying to gauge the teaching of writing in colleges or to shape the administration of writing programs. With surveys such as this one in hand, writing program directors and writing teachers can compare their own practices and programs with those of others.

In constructing our questionnaire for writing program directors, we were guided by the work of previous researchers, such as Albert R. Kitzhaber (see note 4), Elizabeth Cowan (see note 5), Jasper Neel (see note 6), and Claude Gibson (see note 7). We found especially helpful the survey of college writing programs which Gibson reported in 1978. His survey was the most comprehensive of any we found. We tried to design a survey instrument containing questions which would take our survey beyond the scope of his.

Our work on the questionnaire began in September, 1980. From that time until the end of December, we surveyed related studies to determine the kinds of questions we should ask and the amount of information we should attempt to elicit from writing

program directors. During the course of many discussions of preliminary versions of our questions, we decided to develop a complex instrument which would elicit very extensive and in-depth information about college-level writing programs throughout the nation, rather than a less complicated one that could be answered quickly and easily. We decided, in short, that a smaller set of very detailed responses was preferable to a larger set of less detailed ones. A later version of this extensive instrument was reviewed by two of our first-year consultants, Richard L. Larson and Richard Lloyd-Jones, near the end of December.

I. 2. SAMPLE SELECTION AND RESPONSE RATE

In March of 1981, we requested and received from Harvey Wiener and Joseph Comprone the mailing list of the Council of Writing Program Administrators (WPA). This mailing list contained most of the names of the over 550 writing program directors we initially contacted. We mailed a letter to those writing program directors whose names and addresses appeared on the WPA list and to directors we knew who were not members of WPA. The letter explained the nature of the survey we wished to conduct, provided an estimate of the amount of time that would be required to fill out the survey instrument, and asked the directors if they wished to participate. Of these directors, 259 returned the self-addressed, stamped postcard we had included with our letter of inquiry, thereby indicating their willingness to participate in the survey. Each of these directors was sent a copy of our questionnaire, together with a business-reply envelope in which to return the completed form. Of the 259 writing program directors who agreed to complete and return the form, 127 (49.04%) did (see note 8). The extraordinary amount of detailed information the responding writing program directors provided about their programs suggests that our questionnaire was a good one, even if it was not perfect.

Although we are satisfied with the rate of return, we had hoped it would be greater. Two factors contributed to the lower-than-expected rate of return: (1) each writing program director had to spend a minimum of about three hours gathering and recording the information requested by the survey instrument, an amount of time well in excess of our stated estimate; and (2) the writing program directors received the questionnaire during a very hectic period of the academic year, late in the spring semester or quarter.

Some directors indicated that the instrument was not "flexible" enough to elicit accurate information about their programs. Other directors protested--some in very lively and colorful language--that a few of our questions were poorly worded, confusing, or otherwise difficult to understand. Virtually all complained about the amount of time involved in filling out the questionnaire, but most filled it out nonetheless

and did so very conscientiously (see note 9).

I. 3. DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE POPULATION: SCHOOLS AND WRITING PROGRAM DIRECTORS

Of the 127 responding directors, 14 (11.02%) were from two-year colleges, 67 (52.76%) from four-year institutions, and 46 (36.22%) from universities. All areas of the country appear to be adequately represented by the responding writing program directors except the Northwest.

Of the 127 institutions whose writing program directors responded to the survey, 80 (62.98%) received the bulk of their funding from public sources, either federal (see note 10), state, or local; and 47 (37.02%) received their primary funding from private sources, often religious denominations (see note 11). We used taxonomies employed by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) to distinguish among two-year and four-year institutions and universities. Under the NCES's classification system, only institutions with professional schools (e.g., law, medical, dental) or substantial graduate programs are categorized as universities (see note 12). One result of using the NCES's classifications is that any four-year institution in our sample with an enrollment of less than 2,500 and many four-year institutions with enrollments larger than 2,500 were classified as four-year schools, even though some of them have graduate programs and call themselves universities. Thus 24 of the responding institutions are here classified as four-year institutions, even though they are nominally universities. Our use of the NCES classification systems should not indicate our agreement with them; our only reason for so classifying four-year institutions and universities was to allow us to compare our sample population with the larger national population (see note 13). Such comparisons would have been impossible unless common classification systems were employed. Our use of NCES's taxonomies yielded data which are not, unfortunately, strictly comparable to those reported by Gibson in 1978.

One hundred of the 127 responding writing program directors provided information about themselves and the positions they hold. The average term of the writing program director in the 100 institutions is about 3.6 years. Several of the directors, however, reported having titles as new as their programs, and others reported having either permanent or indefinite terms. Of the 100 program directors, 99% have faculty status, and 66% have tenure. Seventy-three percent of the writing program directors in four-year institutions have tenure; in two-year colleges about 63% have tenure; and in universities only about 58% have tenure. Of the writing programs in schools receiving their primary support from public funds, 74% of the directors are tenured. In institutions supported primarily by private funds, only 54% of the directors have tenure. Most (72%) of the directors hold a PhD as their highest degree, while another 12% have an MS or an

MA, 7% an MFA, and 5% an EdD. Only 2% have a DA. The remaining directors (about 3% of the total) hold other, unspecified degrees.

I. 3. 1. Sample Distribution Across Types of Institutions

Table I.1 compares the distribution of our responding institutions across type and primary source of funding. Table I.2 shows the corresponding distribution nationwide of colleges and universities within the same categories.

	Private	%	Public	%	Total	%
2-Year Colleges	1	0.79	13	10.23	14	11.02
4-Year Institutions	32	25.20	35	27.56	67	52.76
Universities	14	11.02	32	25.20	46	36.22
TOTAL	47	37.02	80	62.98	127	100.00

Table I.1. Distribution of Survey Sample by Number and Percentage Across Type of Institution and Principal Source of Funding (N = 127).

	% Private	% Public	% Total
2-Year Colleges	8.55	29.45	38.00
4-Year Institutions	42.35	14.53	56.88
Universities	2.08	3.04	5.12
TOTAL	52.98	47.02	100.00

Table I.2. National Distribution for 1978-79 of Colleges and Universities by Percentage Across Type of Institution and Principal Source of Funding (N = 3,131).

Comparison of Table I.1 and Table I.2 indicates a large number of differences between the distribution of the schools included in our survey and the national distribution across the same categories. In our sample, 52.76% of the schools are classified as four-year institutions not having substantial graduate programs or professional schools attached to them. Nationwide, 56.88% of postsecondary institutions fall into the

category of four-year institutions, thus indicating that our sample differs in this category from the national population by 4.12 percentage points. Other differences are more pronounced. In our sample, 37.02% of the institutions receive their principal funding from private sources and 62.98% from public sources, whereas nationally 52.98% of all institutions receive their primary support from private sources and 47.02% from public sources. With regard to the percentage of universities and two-year colleges, the differences between our sample and the national population are equally large. In our sample, 11.02% of the schools are two-year colleges and 36.22% are universities. In contrast, 38% and 5.12% of all institutions nationwide are two-year colleges and universities, respectively.

I. 3. 2. Sample Distribution Across Size Categories

Differences between our sample of institutions and the larger population are further illustrated in Table I.3 through Table I.7.

Size Categories	All Institutions	Private	Public
LT 1001	39.32	62.02	13.72
1001-2500	26.54	25.32	27.92
2501-5000	12.68	6.75	19.36
5001-10000	11.94	4.10	20.79
10001-20000	6.84	1.51	12.84
GT 20000	2.68	0.30	5.37
TOTALS	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table I.3. National Distribution for 1978-79 by Percentage of Private and Public Institutions Across Size Categories (N = 3,131).

Size Categories	Responding Institutions		Private		Public	
	N	% of Total	N	% of Total	N	% of Total
LT 1001	6	4.72	6	4.72	--	----
1001-2500	19	14.96	17	13.39	2	1.57
2501-5000	24	18.90	7	5.51	17	13.39
5001-10000	22	17.32	9	7.09	13	10.23
10001-20000	28	22.05	4	3.15	24	18.90
GT 20000	28	22.05	4	3.15	24	18.90
TOTALS	127	100.00	47	37.01	80	62.99

Table I.4. Distribution of Private and Public Institutions in Sample Across Size Categories (N = 127).

Comparison of Table I.3 and Table I.4 reveals some striking differences between the distribution of our survey schools and the national population with regard to size categories (see note 14) and primary source of funding. In our sample, for instance, only 4.72% of the institutions have fewer than 1,001 students, whereas nationally the percentage is much higher, 39.32%. In the 1,001-2,500, 2,501-5,000, and 5,001-10,000 categories, the differences are somewhat less pronounced, but nevertheless noteworthy. Extremely important differences between our sample and the national population hold for the 10,001-20,000 and the more-than-20,000 categories. While too few schools with enrollments under 1,001 responded to our questionnaire, an inordinate number of schools with enrollments in excess of 10,000--and especially schools whose enrollments exceed 20,000--completed and returned our questionnaire. Table I.3 and Table I.4 also point to important differences between the distribution of the private and public institutions in our sample across the size categories and the national distribution of like institutions across the same categories. Such differences are presented in more detail in Table I.5, Table I.6, and Table I.7.

Size Categories	2-Year Priv	2-Year Publ	4-Year Priv	4-Year Publ	University Priv	University Publ	TOTALS
LT 1001	--	--	6	--	--	--	6
1001-2500	1	2	16	--	--	--	19
2501-5000	--	4	7	11	--	2	24
5001-10000	--	3	--	9	9	1	22
10001-20000	--	3	3	12	1	9	28
GT 20000	--	1	--	3	4	20	28
TOTALS	1	13	32	35	14	32	127

Table I.5. Distribution of Survey Sample by Type of Institution and Source of Funding Across Size Categories (N = 127).

Size Categories	2-Year Priv	2-Year Publ	4-Year Priv	4-Year Publ	University Priv	University Publ	TOTALS
LT 1001	--	--	4.72	--	--	--	4.72
1001-2500	0.79	1.58	12.60	--	--	--	14.97
2501-5000	--	3.15	5.51	8.66	--	1.58	18.90
5001-10000	--	2.36	--	7.09	7.09	0.79	17.33
10001-20000	--	2.36	2.36	9.45	0.79	7.09	22.05
GT 20000	--	0.79	--	2.36	3.15	15.73	22.03
TOTALS	0.79	10.24	25.19	27.56	11.03	25.19	100.00
Priv/Publ TOTALS	11.03		52.75		36.22		100.00

Table I.6. Percentage Distribution of Survey Sample by Type of Institution and Source of Funding Across Size Categories (N = 127).

Size Categories	2-Year Priv	2-Year Publ	4-Year Priv	4-Year Publ	Universities Priv	Universities Publ	TOTALS
LT 1001	7.54	5.40	25.33	1.05	--	--	39.32
1001-2500	0.89	9.93	12.52	3.19	--	--	26.53
2501-5000	0.06	5.78	3.26	3.29	0.26	0.03	12.68
5001-10000	0.06	5.34	1.12	4.02	0.99	0.42	11.95
10001-20000	--	2.62	0.13	2.46	0.67	0.96	6.84
GT 20000	--	0.38	--	0.51	0.16	1.63	2.68
TOTALS	8.55	29.45	42.36	14.52	2.08	3.04	100.00
Priv/Publ TOTALS	38.00		56.88		5.12		100.00

Table I.7. National Distribution for 1978-79 by Percentage of Private and Public 2-Year Schools, 4-Year Schools, and Universities Across Size Categories (N = 3,131).

As Table I.3 through Table I.7 illustrate, our sample population differs in important ways from the larger population of all institutions. Our sample is least representative of very small institutions, especially small two-year colleges and small four-year colleges with enrollments under 1,001. These institutions make up 40% of all institutions nationally. The small number of responses from such institutions was not totally unexpected since these are the institutions least likely to have formally organized writing programs or even designated directors of composition. Many such small schools would thus probably not be included in a population of schools with organized writing programs. This means that even though our sample is not very representative of nationally accredited institutions included in NCES statistics, it may represent fairly well those institutions which have organized composition programs. The large differences between our sample and the national population make it impossible to get an idea of how things stand nationally without making some fairly ambitious extrapolations from our data, a matter taken up in some detail below.

I. 4. EXTRAPOLATING TO THE NATIONAL POPULATION

The disparity between the makeup of our own sample and the distribution of colleges and universities by type and source of funding across the country requires us to weight the responses from institutions of different types in order to extrapolate from our sample to the population at large.

Consider the following simple illustration of how such adjustments can be made. Suppose a national survey asked 60 men and 40 women their opinions on the deployment of the neutron

bomb. Suppose further, for the purposes of this illustration, that males and females might be expected to hold different opinions on the matter. If we assume that the male/female ratio in the general population is about 50/50, the survey results would have to be weighted to make male and female responses count equally. In this case, each response from a male would need to be multiplied by 0.833 (50 divided by 60) and each response from a female would need to be multiplied by 1.25 (50 divided by 40). Note that in this case weighting of male and female responses is necessary only if the two sets of responses (male vs. female) differ significantly.

When we wanted to extrapolate from our sample to the national population of colleges and universities, we have similarly weighted our data. However, because in some instances--most notably with respect to two-year colleges--our sample differs considerably from the national population, our national projections should be viewed with some caution. In short, we are uncertain how representative the data collected from two-year colleges are. Nevertheless, we believe our projections give the best (if not the only) estimate to date of how writing programs work across the country.

I. 5. EXTRAPOLATING BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE AND ENROLLMENT

Table I.8 and Table I.9 show how our data were transformed in order to extrapolate to the national population of colleges and universities.

Type of Institution	Enrollment in Thousands	Normalized by Number of Institutions	Normalized by Total Enrollment in Thousands	Trans. for Institutions	Trans. for Enrollment
2-Year (1)	1.8	10.87	19.76	10.87	10.98
4-Year (32)	93.1	53.79	208.53	1.68	2.27
Univ. (14)	184.4	2.64	93.56	0.19	0.51

Table I.8. Real and Normalized Distributions and Transformations for Normalization of Private Institutions in Survey Sample (N = 47).

Type of Institution	Enrollment in Thousands	Normalized by Number of Institutions	Normalized by Total Enrollment in Thousands	Trans. for Institutions	Trans. for Enrollment
2-Year (13)	104.9	37.40	504.46	2.88	4.81
4-Year (35)	351.4	18.46	371.14	0.53	1.06
Univ. (32)	730.5	3.85	268.57	0.12	0.37

Table I.9. Real and Normalized Distributions and Transformations for Normalization of Public Institutions in Survey Sample (N = 80).

Table I.8 and Table I.9 show the actual distribution of our sample and the distribution we would need in order to have a nationally representative sample both in terms of number of institutions and total enrollment. The last two columns in each table show the transformations used to extrapolate from our sample to the national population. Note that a "1" in a transformation table would mean that the sample is already representative. Consider, for example, the numbers in Table I.9. Column 3 lists the national ratios among the three types of public institutions listed in column 1. In our sample, 13 responding institutions are public two-year colleges. If our sample were to reflect the national distribution of public two-year colleges, we would need to have 37.4 such institutions represented in our sample. To transform our data to reflect the national distribution by institutions, we would multiply our 13 public two-year colleges by 2.88, which appears in column 5, and arrive at 37.4, which represents the proportion of two-year colleges to four-year institutions and universities nationally. With the transformation factors listed in columns 5 and 6, we can adjust our sample to the national distributions for both number of institutions and total enrollment. Such transformations are used later as weights when we make comparisons between our results and what would be expected nationally. Note that the extrapolations for two-year colleges are the weak link in the national projections reported in the following sections.

CHAPTER II

REQUIRED AND ELECTIVE WRITING COURSES

In the present chapter, we report on the numbers of required and elective writing courses taught in various types of institutions at various curricular levels.

II. 1. NUMBERS AND LEVELS OF REQUIRED WRITING COURSES

Required composition courses constitute an important part of a college or university writing program. These courses attract the largest number of students and pose the most severe and frequent staffing problems, especially at the freshman level. As a part of our effort to develop a profile of college-level writing programs, we tried to find out how many public and private two-year colleges, four-year institutions, and universities have required courses at various levels in the curriculum. Our findings appear in Table II.1.

Required Comp Course	2-Year N (14)	2-Year %	4-Year Private N (32)	4-Year Private %	4-Year Public N (32)	4-Year Public %	Univ. Private N (13)	Univ. Private %	Univ. Public N (30)	Univ. Public %
Freshman										
None at Freshman	1	7.7	3	9.4	3	9.4	1	7.7	-	---
One at Freshman	5	38.5	6	18.8	9	28.1	3	23.1	6	20.0
Two at Freshman	8	61.5	23	71.9	20	62.5	9	69.2	24	80.0
TOTALS	14	100.0	32	100.0	32	100.0	13	100.0	30	100.0
Non-Freshman										
At Least One at Sophomore	1	7.1	6	18.8	9	28.1	1	7.7	8	26.7
At Least One at Junior	-	---	3	9.4	4	12.5	1	7.7	8	26.7
At Least One at Senior	-	---	1	3.1	1	3.1	-	---	-	---
TOTALS	1		10		14		2		16	

Table II.1. Number of Responding Institutions Requiring Composition Courses at Four Curricular Levels (N = 121).

As Table II.1 indicates, freshman composition courses constitute the major component of almost all college writing programs. Our data indicate few differences across types of institutions, but private institutions appear to require somewhat fewer composition courses than do public institutions. Of the 121 institutions for which data on required courses are available, 113 (93.4%) require their students to take at least one composition course at the freshman level, with only eight of the schools (6.6%) requiring no composition courses at the freshman level. Twenty-nine of the 113 schools (24%) have only a one-course requirement at the freshman level, while 84 (69.4%) have a two- or three-course requirement at the freshman level. For non-freshman requirements, 25 (20.7%) schools require at least one composition course at the sophomore level, while 16 (13.2%) require at least one course at the junior level and two (1.67%) require at least one course at the senior level.

Table II.1 also shows that of the 14 two-year colleges in our sample, only one (7.1%) requires at least one writing course beyond the freshman level. A larger percentage of four-year institutions and of universities requires writing courses beyond the freshman level. Of the 64 private and public four-year

institutions that responded to our question, 24 (37.5%) require at least one writing course beyond the freshman level; and of the 43 universities, 18 (41.86%) make such a requirement. The differences between private and public schools within these two categories are also interesting, especially for universities. Ten (31.25%) of the 32 private four-year institutions and 14 (43.75%) of the 32 public four-year institutions require at least one writing course beyond the freshman year. Among the universities, only two (15.38%) of the 13 private schools require a course beyond the freshman level, but 16 (53.33%) of the 30 public universities do. These latter percentages may suggest a greater service role for programs housed in public universities than for those in private.

II. 2. NUMBERS AND LEVELS OF ELECTIVE WRITING COURSES

Elective, or non-required, composition courses are also an important part of college writing programs. Table II.2 shows the number of institutions offering elective composition courses at the four undergraduate levels.

Elective Comp Course	2-Year		4-Year				Univ.			
			Private		Public		Private		Public	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
	(14)		(32)		(32)		(13)		(30)	
At Freshman Level	10	71.4	13	40.6	10	31.3	8	61.5	8	26.7
At Sophomore Level	13	92.9	24	75.0	24	75.0	11	84.6	24	80.0
At Junior Level	--	----	26	81.3	22	68.8	9	69.2	28	87.5
At Senior Level	--	----	23	71.9	21	65.6	9	69.2	22	73.3

Table II.2. Number of Responding Institutions with Elective Composition Courses at Four Curricular Levels (N = 121).

Table II.2 indicates a demand for non-required composition courses. Since students are not forced into elective courses, the large number of such courses offered at all four undergraduate levels would seem to suggest that students want to earn more credit hours in composition than degree programs

themselves require.

Of the 121 institutions for which we received data on elective courses, 49 (40.5%) offer at least one elective writing course at the freshman level. This number is probably as small as it is because so many institutions have required freshman courses or course sequences.

At the sophomore level, 96 (79.34%) of the 121 schools indicate that they offer at least one elective writing course at that level. Nearly 93% of the two-year colleges and at least 75% of all other institutions offer elective courses at this level.

At the junior level--from which two-year colleges are, of course, excluded--85 (70.3%) of the 121 schools offer elective courses. Over 80% of private four-year schools and about 70% of private universities offer junior-level elective courses. About 70% of the public four-year schools offer such courses. Most impressive is the fact that over 87% of the public universities offer elective courses at the junior-level.

The percentage of institutions offering elective courses at the senior level is generally lower than the percentage of institutions offering elective courses at the junior level.

II. 3. WRITING COURSES IN "OTHER" DEPARTMENTS OR COLLEGES

While our major concern in the present survey is with writing programs housed in departments such as English, we were mindful in constructing our questionnaire that not all required writing courses are taught in such departments. Hence we asked the writing program directors we surveyed whether departments or colleges other than their own taught any required writing courses on their campuses. The responses to this question indicate that English departments, which have traditionally shouldered most of the responsibility for teaching composition, may be getting a fair amount of help from faculty in other disciplines. In fact, the help may be greater than our data show, since it is possible that some of the directors responding to our survey did not have knowledge of courses offered in other departments or colleges on their campuses. Of the 113 writing program directors who responded to this question, 18.5% indicated they knew of another department or college that teaches at least one required writing course at the freshman level. The percentage, 21.7, is somewhat higher for required courses at the sophomore level and then drops off to 15.5 and 10.3, respectively, for junior- and senior-level required writing courses taught in other colleges or departments. Nevertheless, these figures indicate that departments in addition to English departments are assuming part of the responsibility for teaching college students to write. Although it was not possible to collect any data about these other required courses, it would be interesting to learn about them, to see how they

differ from the typical fare offered through English department programs.

CHAPTER III

TYPES, DISTRIBUTIONS, AND SIZES OF WRITING COURSES

Three important aspects of composition programs are the kinds of writing courses taught, the distribution of those courses across curricular levels, and the number of students enrolled in the various sections of those courses. With the responses to our questionnaire, we were able to determine the number of sections of particular kinds of writing courses offered at various curricular levels, and the average class size of those sections.

III. 1. TYPES AND DISTRIBUTIONS OF WRITING COURSES IN RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS

Our questionnaire enabled us to examine in some detail the number and kinds of introductory and non-introductory writing courses offered in two-year colleges, in private and public four-year institutions, and in private and public universities. For introductory courses, we examined the offerings at the freshman and sophomore levels; and for non-introductory courses, we examined the offerings at the freshman, sophomore, and upper-division levels.

III. 1. 1. Types and Distribution of Writing Courses: Two-Year Colleges

Because the number of two-year colleges responding to our questionnaire is so small, we do not distinguish in the present section between private and public two-year colleges. However, we do make that distinction in subsequent sections where we treat four-year institutions and universities.

Introductory Courses: Two-Year Colleges. Table III.1 presents the number of sections of introductory writing courses of different types offered at two curricular levels in two-year colleges, and Table III.2 presents comparable data for non-introductory writing courses.

Introductory Comp Course	Freshman Level Sections	%	Sophomore Level Sections	%	Total Sections	%
Expos Wr	737	58.77	1	0.08	738	58.85
Lit & Crit Wr	261	20.81	-	----	261	20.81
Tech Wr	58	4.64	-	----	58	4.64
ESL	12	0.95	-	----	12	0.95
Remedial Wr	174	13.88	-	----	174	13.88
Other	11	0.87	-	----	11	0.87
TOTALS	1253	99.92	1	0.08	1254	100.00

Table III.1. Number of Sections of Introductory Composition Courses in Responding Two-Year Colleges.

Non-Intro Comp Course	Freshman Level Sections	%	Sophomore Level Sections	%	Total Sections	%
Expos Wr	10	8.47	4	3.39	14	11.86
Bus Wr	37	31.36	2	1.69	39	33.05
Tech Wr	11	9.32	13	11.02	24	20.34
Art/Journ Wr	8	6.78	6	5.08	14	11.86
Creat Wr	8	6.78	19	16.10	27	22.88
Other	-	----	--	----	--	----
TOTALS	74	62.71	44	37.29	118	100.00

Table III.2. Number of Sections of Non-Introductory Composition Courses Taught in Responding Two-Year Colleges.

As Table III.1 reveals, most of the writing courses in two-year colleges are courses in expository writing, "Literature and critical writing," and remedial writing, in that order of frequency. Of the 1,254 sections of introductory writing courses taught in our responding two-year colleges, 737 (58.77%) are expository writing courses at the freshman level. "Introduction to literature and critical writing" accounts for another 20.81% of the total number of introductory writing sections, while remedial writing, with 174 sections, accounts for an additional 13.88%. About 5% of the total number of sections of introductory composition courses are taught in technical writing courses. In the responding two-year institutions, only one introductory writing course is offered beyond the freshman year.

Non-Introductory Courses: Two-Year Colleges. Table III.2 reveals that of the 1,372 sections of writing taught in the responding two-year colleges, only 118 (8.60%) are non-introductory writing courses. Of these 118 sections of various types of writing courses, 62.71% are taught at the freshman level, whereas 99.92% of the introductory courses are taught at the freshman level. Of the 74 non-introductory writing sections taught at the freshman level, over 40% are taught in business or technical writing courses. About 37% of the non-introductory sections are taught at the sophomore level, and 72.73% of those 44 are taught either in technical or creative writing courses.

The data from Table III.1 and Table III.2 collectively indicate two important things about the teaching of writing in the responding two-year colleges: (1) very little composition is being taught beyond the freshman year; and (2) very little non-introductory composition is being taught at all. We speculate that degree programs offered in two-year colleges may provide fewer opportunities for students to enroll in writing courses, whether introductory or non-introductory. This is a matter that, if our data accurately reflect what is happening nationally, ought to be explored in some detail at a later time.

We need to end this section on types of writing offered in two-year colleges with a caution: with so few two-year colleges responding to our questionnaire, we simply do not know whether the findings reported above are representative of all two-year colleges. And because only two-year institutions with formal writing programs probably responded to our questionnaire, it is possible that significantly less writing is taught in two-year colleges than our data and subsequent projections suggest.

III. 1. 2. Types and Distribution Writing Courses: Four-Year Institutions

As we did for the two-year colleges, we examined the number and kinds of writing courses in four-year institutions. In the case of the four-year institutions, however, we were able to examine differences across private and public institutions as well as across introductory and non-introductory courses and curricular levels. Tables III.3, III.4, III.5, and III.6 give the results for four-year institutions.

Introductory Comp Course	Freshman Level Sections	%	Sophomore Level Sections	%	Total Sections	%
Expos Wr	656	62.84	2	0.20	658	63.04
Lit & Crit Wr	168	16.09	5	0.48	173	16.57
Tech Wr	11	1.05	1	0.10	12	1.15
ESL	37	3.54	-	----	37	3.54
Remedial Wr	66	6.32	-	----	66	6.32
Other	85	8.14	13	1.24	98	9.38
TOTALS	1023	97.98	21	2.02	1044	100.00

Table III.3. Number of Sections of Introductory Composition Courses Taught in Responding Private Four-Year Institutions.

Non-Intro Comp Course	Freshman Level Sect	%	Sophomore Level Sect	%	Upper Division Sect	%	Total Sect	%
Expos. Wr	10	4.37	12	5.24	10	4.37	32	13.98
Bus Wr	1	0.44	36	15.71	16	6.98	53	23.15
Tech Wr	--	----	1	0.44	34	14.85	35	15.28
Art/Journ Wr	6	2.62	7	3.06	34	14.85	47	20.52
Creat Wr	8	3.49	9	3.93	37	16.16	54	23.58
Other	--	----	--	----	8	3.49	8	3.49
TOTALS	25	10.92	65	28.38	139	60.70	229	100.00

Table III.4. Number of Sections of Non-Introductory Composition Courses Taught in Responding Private Four-Year Institutions.

Introductory Comp Course	Freshman Level Sections	%	Sophomore Level Sections	%	Total Sections	%
Expos Wr	2005	61.10	112	3.41	2117	64.51
Lit & Crit Wr	236	7.19	166	5.06	402	12.25
Tech Wr	51	1.55	10	0.30	61	1.85
ESL	54	1.64	30	0.91	84	2.55
Remedial Wr	493	15.03	--	----	493	15.03
Other	71	2.16	54	1.64	125	3.80
TOTALS	2910	88.67	372	11.33	3282	100.00

Table III.5. Number of Sections of Introductory Composition Courses Taught In Responding Public Four-Year Institutions.

Non-Intro Comp Course	Freshman Level Sect	%	Sophomore Level Sect	%	Upper Division Sect	%	Total Sect	%
Expos Wr	31	4.53	122	17.81	145	21.17	298	43.50
Bus Wr	1	0.15	2	0.29	11	1.61	14	2.04
Tech Wr	3	0.44	3	0.44	102	14.89	108	15.77
Art/Journ Wr	4	0.58	12	1.75	47	6.86	63	9.20
Creat Wr	17	2.48	17	2.48	86	12.55	120	17.52
Other	--	----	2	0.29	80	11.68	82	11.97
TOTALS	56	8.18	158	23.07	471	68.76	685	100.00

Table III.6. Number of Sections of Non-Introductory Composition Courses Taught in Responding Public Four-Year Institutions.

Tables III.3 through III.6 show that as is the case with two-year colleges, the most extensively offerewriting course is introductory expository writing. There is, however, an important difference between private and public four-year institutions when it comes to the second and third most extensively offered courses. In private four-year institutions as in the responding two-year colleges, "introduction to literature and critical writing" courses are the second most extensively offered writing courses at any level; but in public four-year institutions, such courses are the third most extensively taught courses, with courses in remedial writing the second most extensively taught.

Introductory Courses: Four-Year Institutions. Table III.3

reveals that in our sample of 32 private four-year institutions, 1,044 sections of introductory writing courses are taught. This figure contrasts with the 3,282 sections of introductory writing taught in the corresponding 35 public four-year institutions, as depicted in Table III.5. At the freshman level, both types of four-year institutions teach about the same percentage of introductory freshman writing sections, 62.84% for the private institutions and 61.1% for the public ones. Across both curricular levels, the percentages are about the same, 63.04% for the private schools and 64.51% for the public schools. The percentages of freshman sections of "introduction to literature and critical writing" do, however, differ. In the private institutions, 16.09% of all sections of introductory composition are taught in such courses, while only 7.19% of the sections in public four-year institutions are. It should be noted, however, that at the sophomore level only 0.48% of all sections of introductory composition classes are "introduction to literature and critical writing" courses in private four-year institutions, while at the same curricular level in public institutions a little over 5% of all sections of introductory composition are of this type. Across both curricular levels, we see that 16.57% of all sections of introductory writing are of this type in the private institutions, while 12.25% are of this type in the public institutions. These differences would seem to indicate that an "introduction to literature and critical writing" course serves as the basic composition course in private four-year institutions with greater frequency than it does in corresponding public institutions.

One apparently significant difference between the two types of four-year schools is in the percentage of total sections of introductory writing taught in remedial courses. In the private institutions, only 6.32% of all sections of introductory writing are taught in remedial courses, while 15.03% are taught in remedial courses in public institutions. This difference is probably a result of differences in the student populations attracted to the two types of institutions and of differences in admissions policies.

Another important difference between the two types of institutions is seen in the respective percentages of total sections of introductory writing taught at the sophomore level. In the private institutions, only 2.02% of all sections of introductory writing courses are taught at the sophomore level; but in the public institutions, 11.33% of all sections of introductory writing courses are taught at that level. It may mean that most English departments in private four-year schools are organized along very traditional lines, seeing composition as an important part of the curriculum only at the freshman level, or it may mean that students in private institutions are better prepared to do college-level writing and need introductory courses only at the freshman level.

Non-Introductory Courses: Four-Year Institutions. With respect to the offering of non-introductory writing courses in

private and public four-year institutions, some differences and similarities appear, as illustrated by Table III.4 and Table III.6. The ratio of sections of non-introductory writing to all sections of writing courses whether introductory or non-introductory is about the same. In the private four-year schools, 17.99% of all sections are sections of non-introductory writing courses; and in the public institutions the percentage of all sections is 17.27.

The percentages of non-introductory sections taught at the freshman level do not differ substantially across the two types of institutions. At the sophomore level, the difference between the percentages is greater, 28.38% in private institutions compared with 23.07 in public. Whereas the public institutions offer a greater percentage of non-introductory expository writing sections at the sophomore level (17.81% compared with 5.24%), the private institutions offer a greater percentage of non-introductory business writing sections than do the public schools (15.71% compared with 0.29%). This is an important difference for which we have no certain explanation. It may, of course, be that only one or two schools which teach much business writing at the sophomore level account for this large difference. It could also be that private four-year institutions teach courses in English departments which are taught in other departments or colleges at public four-year institutions.

The percentages for the upper-division non-introductory composition sections also differ across types of four-year institutions. In the private schools, 60.7% of all non-introductory sections are taught as upper-division sections, while 68.76% are taught as upper-division classes in public institutions. The differences within the class of upper-division sections are interesting, and probably important. With respect to non-introductory expository writing sections, 21.17% in the public institutions fall into this category, while only 4.37% in private institutions do. This rather large difference between the two groups may suggest that the "writing across the curriculum" movement has had a larger impact on public four-year schools than on private. Differences between the number of business writing sections offered at the sophomore level is maintained at the upper-division level in four-year institutions, with 6.98% of all non-introductory sections in private institutions being offered in business writing courses, compared with 1.61% in public institutions. The percentages for technical and creative writing are comparable for the two types of institutions, but the percentage of non-introductory sections devoted to article and journalistic writing in the two types of institutions varies considerably (14.85% for private institutions and 6.86% for public). This difference may be attributable to the fact that in public institutions, such specialized courses at the upper-division level are frequently taught in, for example, a college of communication.

Table III.4 and Table III.6 also show some important differences across the three curricular levels with respect to

the number of sections of different types of non-introductory composition courses offered in private and public four-year institutions. In the private institutions, 13.98% of non-introductory writing classes are offered in expository writing courses; but in public schools 43.5% are. A large difference also appears for business writing, with 23.15% of all non-introductory sections in private schools being offered in business writing classes and 2.04% in public four-year institutions. Again, professional colleges of business in public institutions may account for a substantial number of business writing courses not offered in English departments. The percentage for technical writing sections is nearly identical, but more sections, relatively speaking, of article and journalistic writing are offered in private schools than in public, a difference we attempted to explain earlier; and a little less creative writing seems to be taught at the non-introductory level in public four-year institutions than in private (17.52% compared with 23.58%).

III. 1. 3. Types and Distribution of Writing Courses: Universities

Comparisons like those we have made between private and public four-year institutions were also made between private and public universities. The data for these comparisons are summarized in Tables III.7 through III.10.

Introductory Comp Course	Freshman Level Sections	%	Sophomore Level Sections	%	Total Sections	%
Expos Wr	946	69.20	--	----	946	69.20
Lit & Crit Wr	237	17.34	--	----	237	17.34
Tech Wr	12	0.88	--	----	12	0.88
ESL	53	3.88	--	----	53	3.88
Remedial Wr	92	6.73	--	----	92	6.73
Other	27	1.98	--	----	27	1.98
TOTALS	1367	100.00	--	----	1367	100.00

Table III.7. Number of Sections of Introductory Composition Courses Taught in Responding Private Universities.

Non-Intro Comp Course	Freshman Level Sect	%	Sophomore Level Sect	%	Upper Division Sect	%	Total Sect	%
Expos Wr	2	0.72	23	8.33	71	25.72	96	34.78
Bus Wr	2	0.72	16	5.80	16	5.80	34	12.32
Tech Wr	2	0.72	--	----	32	11.59	34	12.32
Art/Journ Wr	2	0.72	4	1.45	4	1.45	10	3.62
Creat Wr	17	6.16	10	3.62	46	16.67	73	26.45
Other	25	9.06	3	1.09	1	0.36	29	10.51
TOTALS	50	18.12	56	20.29	170	61.59	276	100.0

Table III.8. Number of Sections of Non-Introductory Composition Courses Taught in Responding Private Universities.

Introductory Comp Course	Freshman Level Sections	%	Sophomore Level Sections	%	Total Sections	%
Exp Wr	4490	54.06	3	0.04	4493	54.10
Lit & Crit	1564	18.83	519	6.25	2083	25.08
Tech Wr	164	1.97	22	0.26	186	2.24
ESL	104	1.25	--	----	104	1.25
Remedial Wr	571	6.88	--	----	571	6.88
Other	868	10.45	--	----	868	10.45
TOTALS	7761	93.44	544	6.55	8305	100.00

Table III.9. Number of Sections of Introductory Composition Courses Taught in Responding Public Universities.

Non-Intro Comp Course	Freshman Level Sect	%	Sophomore Level Sect	%	Upper Division Sect	%	Total Sect	%
Exp Wr	173	11.15	164	10.57	128	8.25	465	29.96
Bus Wr	--	----	103	6.64	143	9.21	246	15.85
Tech Wr	2	0.13	156	10.05	249	16.04	407	26.22
Art/Journ Wr	9	0.58	10	0.64	18	1.16	37	2.38
Creat Wr	48	3.09	85	5.48	196	12.63	329	21.20
Other	--	----	43	2.77	25	1.61	68	4.38
TOTALS	232	14.95	561	36.15	759	48.90	1552	100.0

Table III.10. Number of Sections of Non-Introductory Composition Courses Taught in Responding Public Universities.

Introductory Courses: Universities. As Table III.7 and Table III.9 indicate, some important differences, as well as some similarities, appear between the percentages of sections of introductory writing courses in private and public universities. In both cases, the largest number of sections are taught in introductory expository writing courses at the freshman level. In responding private universities, 69.2% of all introductory sections are taught in freshman expository writing courses, compared with only 54.06% for public universities. This difference in percentages is somewhat misleading, because of the percentage of sections represented in the "other" category for both types of universities. In the case of the private universities, only 1.98% of the total number of sections of introductory composition fall into the "other" category. In the public universities, 10.45% of all introductory sections are classified as "other." This large difference is attributable to the teaching in some public universities--The University of Iowa, for example--of freshman writing courses with titles like "Speech and Writing." Such introductory writing courses, which grew out of the communications arts movement of the late 1940's and early 1950's, account for most of the difference between the percentages for the "other" category. Differences between the percentages for the other types of courses offered at the freshman level in the two types of institutions are not substantial. Table III.7 and Table III.9 also indicate that few introductory composition courses are offered at the sophomore level in either private or public universities. Of the 9,672 sections of introductory writing courses taught in our responding private and public universities, only 544 (5.62%) are taught at the sophomore level. Most of these 544 sections are accounted for by introductory courses in "literature and critical writing" in public universities. These classes account for 6.25% of the total number of introductory sections in public universities and are not taught at all at the the sophomore level in private

universities.

Non-Introductory Courses: Universities. The differences between the private and public universities with regard to non-introductory writing courses, as represented in Table III.8 and Table III.10, are more pronounced. Non-introductory writing courses account for about the same percentage of total sections of writing courses in private and public universities (16.80% for private and 15.75% for public). At the freshman level, non-introductory expository writing is taught with a much higher frequency in public institutions than in private, 11.15% compared with 0.72%. This difference is partially offset by the fact that "other" non-introductory freshman writing courses account for 9.06% of the total number of non-introductory sections in private universities, while freshman-level "other" courses do not figure at all among the non-introductory courses taught in public universities. We have no satisfactory explanations of these differences at the freshman level. At the sophomore level, non-introductory sections account for 20.29% of all such sections taught in all private universities and 36.15% of all non-introductory sections taught in public universities. The bulk of this difference is accounted for by the significantly larger number of sections of technical writing (representing 10.05% of all non-introductory sections) taught in the public universities, a course not taught at the sophomore level in our responding private universities. In private universities, sections of business writing and of technical writing account for only 24.64% of all non-introductory sections of writing courses. In contrast, these same courses represent 42.07% of all non-introductory sections in public universities. These differences may suggest that in some public universities, technical writing and business writing courses are offered as options for, say, a second required course in composition. Across the other types of courses at the sophomore level, the percentages for private and public universities are comparable, although public universities seem to offer more sections of expository writing and business writing.

The upper-division level is where some of the more pronounced differences between private and public universities appear. For private universities, the percentage of all non-introductory sections represented by the upper-division sections is 61.59%. The comparable number for public universities is 48.9%. Apparently insignificant differences between the private and public schools show up for the percentages of article and journalistic writing sections and "other" sections. Larger differences appear for sections of business and technical writing, with public universities teaching a higher percentage (25.2% compared with 16.04%) of sections of these courses than private. The opposite is true for creative writing, where the percentage is 16.67 for private universities and 12.63 for public universities. The largest difference between the two types of universities with respect to non-introductory upper-division sections of writing courses is in the percentage of expository writing. In public universities,

only 8.25% of non-introductory sections of writing are accounted for by upper-division expository, non-introductory writing; in private universities, the comparable sections account for 25.72% of all non-introductory sections. This large difference may suggest that less expository writing at the upper-division level is taught in public universities; but it may also indicate that more upper-division expository writing is being taught in departments and colleges outside the English department in public universities.

III. 2 TYPES AND DISTRIBUTION OF WRITING COURSES: ALL SCHOOLS

The summary tables we have presented of the numbers of sections of writing courses of different kinds taught in private and public schools of three types can be collapsed to give a picture of the number of sections of writing taught across all of the schools included in our sample. Table III.11 and Table III.12 summarize the data collapsed across all institutions reponding to our questionnaire.

Introductory Comp Course	Freshman Level Sections	%	Sophomore Level Sections	%	Total Sections	%
Expos Wr	8834	57.92	118	0.77	8952	58.69
Lit & Crit Wr	2466	16.17	690	4.52	3156	20.69
Tech Wr	296	1.94	33	0.22	329	2.16
ESL	260	1.70	30	0.20	290	1.90
Remedial Wr	1396	9.15	---	----	1396	9.15
Other Wr	1062	6.96	67	0.44	1129	7.40
TOTALS	14314	93.85	938	6.15	15252	100.00

Table III.11. Number of Sections of Introductory Composition Courses Taught in All Responding Institutions.

Non-Intro Comp Course	Freshman Level Sections	%	Sophomore Level Sections	%	Upper Division Sections	%	Total Sections	%
Expos Wr	226	7.90	325	11.36	354	12.38	905	31.64
Bus Wr	41	1.43	159	5.56	186	6.50	386	13.50
Tech Wr	18	0.63	173	6.05	417	14.58	608	21.26
Art/Jour Wr	29	1.01	39	1.36	103	3.60	171	5.98
Creat Wr	98	3.43	140	4.90	365	12.76	603	21.08
Other Wr	25	0.87	48	1.68	114	3.99	187	6.54
TOTALS	437	15.28	884	30.91	1539	53.81	2860	100.00

Table III.12. Number of Sections of Non-Introductory Composition Courses Taught in All Responding Institutions.

By summing across Table III.11 and Table III.12, we see that our responding institutions teach a total of 18,112 sections of writing courses. Of this total, 15,252 (84.21%) are taught in introductory writing courses and 2,860 (15.79%) are taught in non-introductory writing courses. Not surprisingly, the largest course of all those listed in the two tables is freshman introductory expository writing, which accounts for 57.92% of all introductory sections and 48.77% of all sections taught. The next largest course is "introdcution to literature and critical writing." It accounts for 16.17% of all introductory sections and 13.62% of all sections. Thus collectively, the two courses most likely to serve as the basic writing course for the majority of the students enrolled in the schools included in our sample account for 62.39% of all sections taught. If the 1,396 sections of remedial writing (which represents 9.15% of all introductory sections and 7.71% of all sections) are pooled with the sections of introductory expository writing and "introduction to literature and critical writing," then over 70% of all sections taught are essentially first or beginning courses in college-level writing.

These percentages suggest that great attention is being paid to the teaching of writing. However, when one considers that less than 30% of all sections taught in the responding institutions are in courses other than beginning freshman courses, one realizes that, relatively speaking, very little composition is being taught beyond the freshman year. When percentages are calculated on the basis of all 14,314 sections of introductory freshman writing, we find that beginning freshman writing courses account for 93.85% of all introductory sections of writing and 79.03% of all sections of writing. This means that only 20.97% of all 18,112 sections are devoted to the teaching of writing beyond either the introductory or the freshman level.

III. 3. A NATIONAL PROJECTION OF TYPES AND DISTRIBUTION OF WRITING COURSES

On the basis of the data we have summarized above, we extrapolated from our sample to the national population of postsecondary institutions. Using the transformations for enrollment listed for private and public schools in Table I.8 and Table I.9, we adjusted our data to make them reflect the national distribution of two-year colleges, private and public four-year institutions, and private and public universities. When these adjustments were made, it became possible to project the percentage of all sections of introductory and non-introductory writing courses taught throughout the country.

III. 3. 1. National Projections for Introductory and Non-Introductory Courses by Institutional Type

These projections for all institutions, regardless of type and primary source of support, appear in Table III.13 and Table III.14.

Institutions	% of Projected Intro Sections	% of Projected Total Sections
2-Year	39.10	33.68
Private 4-Year	14.85	12.79
Public 4-Year	22.11	19.05
Private Univ	4.43	3.82
Public Univ	19.51	16.81
TOTALS	100.00	86.15

Table III.13. Projected National Distribution Across All Institutions of Projected Sections of Introductory Writing Courses.

Institutions	% of Projected Non-Intro Sections	% of Projected Total Sections
2-year	22.85	3.17
Private 4-Year	20.24	2.80
Public 4-Year	28.64	3.97
Private Univ	5.54	0.77
Public Univ	22.72	3.15
TOTALS	100.00	13.85

Table III.14. Projected National Distribution Across All Institutions of Projected Sections of Non-Introductory Writing Courses.

Table III.13 and Table III.14 reveal that nationally 86.15% of all sections of writing are taught in introductory courses and only 13.85% are taught in non-introductory courses. Of projected sections of introductory writing courses, 39.1% are taught in two-year colleges. Private and public four-year institutions teach 36.96% of the introductory sections taught nationwide, and private and public universities teach 23.94% of those sections. Similar proportional differences obtain when the percentage of introductory sections is calculated on the basis of all sections of writing courses taught nationwide, as reflected in column 3 of Table III.13. Table III.14, which presents the national projections for non-introductory sections of writing courses, also contains some important figures. Of all non-introductory sections taught nationally, two-year colleges teach 22.85% of them, while private and public four-year institutions teach 48.88% and private and public universities teach 28.26%. The greater percentage of non-introductory sections taught in four-year institutions and universities as compared to the percentage of introductory sections is explained by the fact that two-year colleges offer no writing courses beyond the sophomore level. According to our projections of all sections of writing taught nationwide, two-year colleges teach 36.85% of them. This particular percentage is to be expected because two-year colleges account for 38% of all institutions nationally and because enrollments in two-year colleges account for about 36% of all students in postsecondary institutions. If our projections are accurate, the figure suggests that a great deal more research ought to be done in and more attention paid nationally to the teaching of writing in two-year colleges than has been done to date. The projected percentage for two-year colleges is exceeded only by the combined percentage for private and public four-year institutions, which is 38.61. We project that private and public universities account collectively for only 24.55% of all sections of writing courses taught nationally.

III. 3. 2. National Projections of Course Types for Types of Institutions

The percentages presented by Table III.13 and Table III.14 can be divided to show the distribution nationally across different types of writing courses for our various classes of institutions. These distributions are summarized in Table III.15 through III.18.

Type of Writing Course	% of Projected Sections of Introductory Courses
Expos Wr	60.25
Lit & Crit Wr	18.98
Tech Wr	2.87
ESL	1.87
Remedial Wr	11.33
Other	4.70
TOTAL	100.00

Table III.15. Projected National Distribution of Sections Across Types of Introductory Courses for All Types of Institutions.

Types of Writing Courses	% of Projected Non-Introductory Sections
Expos Wr	26.72
Bus Wr	17.08
Tech Wr	18.87
Art/Journ Wr	10.32
Creat Wr	21.29
Other	5.72
TOTAL	100.00

Table III.16. Projected National Distribution of Sections Across Types of Non-Introductory Courses for All Types of Institutions.

Types of Courses	% Taught in Types of Institutions 2-Year	Pr 4-Year	Pu 4-Year	Pr Univ	Pu Univ
Expos Wr	23.03	9.36	14.24	3.06	10.56
Lit & Cr Wr	8.15	2.46	2.71	0.77	4.89
Tech Wr	1.81	0.17	0.41	0.04	0.44
ESL	0.37	0.53	0.56	0.17	0.24
Remedial Wr	5.43	0.94	3.32	0.30	1.34
Other	0.34	1.39	0.84	0.09	2.04
TOTALS(100)	39.13	14.85	22.08	4.43	19.51

Table III.17. Projected National Distribution of Sections of Introductory Writing Courses Taught in Different Types of Institutions.

Types of Courses	% Taught in Types of Institutions 2-Year	Pr 4-Year	Pu 4-Year	Pr Univ	Pu Univ
Expos Wr	2.71	2.82	12.46	1.93	6.80
Bus Wr	7.55	4.68	0.58	0.68	3.59
Tech Wr	4.65	3.10	4.51	0.68	5.93
Art/Journ Wr	2.71	4.15	2.64	0.20	0.62
Creat Wr	5.23	4.77	5.01	1.47	4.81
Other	----	0.71	3.42	0.59	1.00
TOTALS (100)	22.86	20.25	28.65	5.58	22.66

Table III.18. Projected National Distribution of Sections of Non-Introductory Writing Courses Taught in Different Types of Institutions.

As Table III.15 shows, 60.25% of all sections of introductory writing courses are taught in introductory expository writing courses. This national projection is only slightly higher than the percentage (57.92) observed for our sample, as shown in Table III.11. Our national projection for sections of "introduction to literature and critical writing" courses indicates that nationwide 18.98% of all sections of introductory writing courses are sections of such courses. The national projection accounting for the third largest number of sections of introductory writing courses is the 11.33% for remedial courses. Collectively, these three figures indicate that nearly 91% of all sections of introductory writing courses are taught in courses designed usually to meet some graduation requirement.

Table III.15 indicates considerable range between the high

and low percentages for introductory courses. Smaller ranges between the high and low percentages for non-introductory courses are observed in Table III.16. As with introductory courses, expository writing courses have the largest number of sections among the non-introductory courses with 26.72% of the total number of projected sections. A maximum of 4.21 percentage points separates the percentages of total sections taught in non-introductory business writing courses, technical writing courses, and creative writing courses, with creative writing accounting for the highest percentage of these three courses with 21.29% of the total projected number of non-introductory sections. Apart from the courses falling into our "other" category, article and journalistic writing courses account for the smallest percentage (10.33) of the projected sections of non-introductory courses.

Table III.17 and Table III.18 divide the percentages presented in Table III.15 and Table III.16 across types of institutions. As Table III.17 indicates, the institutional type accounting for the largest number of projected sections of introductory expository writing is the two-year college, with 23.03% of the total number of introductory sections. It should be recalled that both private and public two-year colleges are represented by this category. When the percentages are summed across private and public four-year institutions and universities for the same introductory course, we find that introductory expository writing in four-year institutions accounts for 23.6% of all projected introductory sections and that introductory expository writing in universities accounts for 13.62% of all projected introductory sections. With respect to courses classified as "introduction to literature and critical writing," two-year colleges teach the largest number of sections (8.15% of all projected introductory sections). All four-year institutions account for 5.17% of all projected sections with such a course, and universities account for 5.66% with courses of the same type. Two-year colleges also teach the largest number of introductory technical writing classes and the largest number of remedial classes. For introductory technical writing classes, two-year colleges teach a number of sections equal to 1.81% of all introductory sections, while the comparable percentage for all four-year institutions is 0.58 and for all universities 0.48. For sections of remedial writing courses, two-year college offerings equal 5.43% of the projected total of all introductory sections, while four-year institution offerings account for 4.26% and university offerings account for 1.64%.

Table III.18 provides similar distributional percentages for sections of non-introductory courses across types of institutions. These percentages may be compared with the distribution of classes across our sample institutions by refering to Table III.12. Because two-year colleges do not offer programs beyond the sophomore level, the percentage of total non-introductory sections for that group is considerably lower than it is for introductory sections--22.86% compared with 39.13%. Not unexpectedly, the percentages of total

non-introductory sections in four-year institutions and universities is higher than it is for introductory sections. Four-year institutions account for 36.93% of all introductory sections, and 48.9% of all non-introductory sections. Universities account for 23.94% of all introductory sections and 28.24% of all non-introductory sections. For the most part, four-year institutions teach the largest number of non-introductory sections of writing courses nationwide. One exception is that two-year colleges teach more sections of business writing at the non-introductory level. Universities teach a larger number of sections of non-introductory expository writing, technical writing, and creative writing than two-year colleges; however, with the exception of the number of non-introductory expository writing sections, the differences are not very great. Note that article and journalistic writing courses are taught considerably less often in universities than in four-year institutions and two-year colleges. Of the projected total number of sections nationwide, only 0.82% of them are accounted for by such courses taught in universities, while 2.71% are accounted for by two-year colleges and 6.79% by four-year institutions. This difference, as well as the decreasing number of business writing sections from two-year colleges to universities, may be explained by the presence in universities of other departments and colleges which may teach such courses.

The projections which are presented in Table III.15 through Table III.18 suggest that the profession may want to examine very closely the different kinds of writing courses, both introductory and non-introductory, taught in the various classes of institutions. Certainly the teaching of introductory writing courses in two-colleges accounts for much more of the writing instruction nationwide than those of us in universities might have expected. As Table III.17 and Table III.18 indicate, four-year institutions account for the most writing instruction nationwide. A study investigating differences across classes of schools for similar courses at both the introductory and non-introductory levels may prove most informative.

III. 4. AVERAGE SIZES OF WRITING CLASSES

The information collected by our survey instrument also allowed us to generate a fairly accurate picture of average class sizes for both introductory and non-introductory writing classes across types of institutions. These data are summarized in Table III.19 through Table III.24.

Intro Comp Courses	Freshman Classes	Sophomore Classes
Expos Wr	22.90	23.29
Lit & Crit Wr	27.45	24.92
Tech Wr	22.11	22.00
ESL	18.95	23.00
Remedial Wr	18.95	-----
Other	19.00	18.33

Table III.19. Average Class Size in Introductory Writing Courses in All Responding Institutions (N = 114).

Non-Intro Comp Courses	Freshman Classes	Sophomore Classes	Upper-Division Classes
Expos Wr	19.62	19.33	19.41
Bus Wr	22.50	22.69	20.50
Tech Wr	20.29	21.53	19.85
Art/Journ Wr	18.73	19.00	19.86
Creat Wr	19.00	17.30	17.02
Other	22.50	20.08	18.25

Table III.20. Average Class Size in Non-Introductory Writing Courses in All Responding Institutions (N = 114).

Intro Comp Courses	Two-Year		Four-Year		Univ	
	Fr	Soph	Fr	Soph	Fr	Soph
Expos Wr	24.18	30.00	22.61	16.00	22.81	23.40
Lit & Crit Wr	24.33	-----	25.09	21.75	29.24	26.50
Tech Wr	23.50	-----	20.00	12.00	21.73	24.00
ESL	15.33	-----	21.91	-----	18.44	23.00
Remedial Wr	20.13	-----	20.06	-----	17.55	-----
Other	20.00	-----	18.10	19.00	19.57	-----

Table III.21. Average Class Size in Introductory Writing Courses by Institutional Type (N = 114).

Non-Intro Comp Courses	Freshman Classes	Sophomore Classes	Upper-Division Classes
Expos Wr	14.00	15.00	-----
Bus Wr	21.67	30.00	-----
Tech Wr	21.33	20.75	-----
Art/Journ Wr	16.20	17.33	-----
Creat Wr	17.00	17.17	-----
Other	-----	-----	-----

Table III.22. Average Class Size in Non-Introductory Writing Courses in Two-Year Colleges.

Non-Intro Comp Courses	Freshman Classes	Sophomore Classes	Upper-Division Classes
Expos Wr	20.75	17.44	18.40
Bus Wr	20.00	22.50	20.75
Tech Wr	-----	17.50	19.62
Art/Journ Wr	19.33	18.50	18.60
Creat Wr	16.00	14.17	15.85
Other	-----	17.00	14.88

Table III.23. Average Class Size in Non-Introductory Writing Courses in Four-Year Institutions.

Non-Intro Comp Courses	Freshman Classes	Sophomore Classes	Upper-Division Classes
Expos Wr	20.57	20.58	19.78
Bus Wr	25.00	22.30	25.25
Tech Wr	19.50	22.78	20.00
Art/Journ Wr	22.33	20.60	20.92
Creat Wr	20.67	19.09	17.80
Other	20.00	20.90	19.60

Table III.24. Average Class Size in Non-Introductory Writing Courses in Universities.

These tables, especially the latter three, should be interpreted cautiously. In the case of Table III.22, Table III.23, and Table III.24, the number of instances of some writing courses at some curricular levels is not large enough to give a reliable indication of class size. This is true in particular for courses such as article and journalistic writing at the freshman level. Such limitations should not obtain, however, for the data summarized in Table III.19 and Table III.20. A second caution is necessary: although we have reason to believe that most directors gave us enrollment figures for the beginning of semesters and quarters, it is possible that some gave us figures reflecting class size at the end of the semester or quarter, figures which would reflect attrition from the first of the semester to the end.

According to Table III.19, the course which has the highest enrollment nationwide--introductory expository writing--has an average class size of 22.90. Classes in "literature and critical writing," the second largest writing course nationally, average 27.45 students or 4.50 students more than freshman expository writing courses. This larger average class size probably limits the amount of writing done in those classes. Such introductory classes at the sophomore level are, however, significantly smaller, having on the average about 2.50 fewer students than their freshman counterparts. We also find it noteworthy that ESL classes and remedial classes in writing have an average class size of 18.95 across all institutions. Class size is important for the obvious reason that the larger the number of students in a composition class, the less time the teacher can devote to the writing of any one student. Nationwide ESL and remedial courses, courses whose students demand a good deal of the teacher's time, are smaller than other freshman-level introductory classes.

The average class sizes reported in Table III.20 are also worthy of note. The fact that non-introductory writing classes are generally smaller than introductory writing classes is important because many in our profession believe that smaller writing classes are better writing classes. On the other hand, students in non-introductory composition courses usually require less individual attention from the teacher than students in introductory courses. Of the two student groups, perhaps those who need the least individual help have more of it available to them. Except for article and journalistic writing courses, whose class sizes increase across curricular levels, all non-introductory courses decrease in class size from the freshman to the upper-division level. Business writing courses have the largest classes of any non-introductory course at all curricular levels, perhaps because the forms of writing taught are often shorter, forms such as the business letter and the memorandum. This trend may also reflect a general increase in enrollments in colleges of business.

Table III.21 examines average class size in introductory courses across institutional types. For the course enrolling the largest number of students nationally--expository writing--the

smallest average class size is found in the four-year institutions, while the largest is found in the two-year colleges. Among "literature and critical writing" courses, the smallest classes are found in the two-year colleges, while the largest are found in universities, whether at the freshman or sophomore level. At the freshman level, technical writing classes average from 20 to 23.50, with the four-year institutions having the smallest classes and the two-year colleges the largest. The average size of ESL classes in both two-year colleges and universities is smaller than the average class size for that course across all institutions, while ESL classes in four-year institutions are about 3.5 students above the averagenumber of students. The smallest remedial classes are found in universities. Both two-year colleges and four-year institutions offer remedial classes which are at least one student above the average for all institutions.

Table III.22, Table III.23, and Table III.24 we are hesitant to interpret because non-introductory writing classes represent so few (less than 15%) of the total number of sections taught in our sample. We leave it to our readers to interpret those tables themselves.

III. 5. WRITING COURSES AND SYLLABI

In constructing our questionnaire, we assumed that freshman writing programs organized around course syllabi would differ from those not so organized. We assumed that the presence or absence of course syllabi would indicate the degree of program flexibility with respect to curricular matters and instructional practices. Although we are not able to test our assumptions, we do believe that the importance of the information we found about the use of syllabi suggests the vadidity of our initial assumptions.

Of the 113 responding institutions who teach required freshman writing courses, 73 (64.61%) indicated that they have a formal syllabus for their first-semester/quarter course and 44 (38.94%) indicated that they require their writing teachers to follow that syllabus. Of the 84 institutions that indicated they require a second-semester/quarter course in freshman composition, 56 (66.67%) said they have a formal syllabus for the course, and 32 (38.10%) indicated that they require its use.

Of the 73 institutions having a syllabus for the first-semester/quarter course, 39 (53.43%) are universities, 24 (32.88%) are four-year institutions, and 10 (13.7%) are two-year colleges. Of the 44 schools requiring the use of a first-semester/quarter syllabus, 22 (50%) are universities, 17 (38.64%) are four-year institutions, and 5 (11.37%) are two-year colleges. Of the 56 sampled institutions having a second-semester/quarter formal syllabus, 30 (53.58%) are

universities, 19 (33.93%) are four-year institutions and 7 (12.5%) are two-year colleges. Of the 32 schools requiring the use of a second-semester/quarter syllabus, 16 (50%) are universities, 12 (37.5%) are four-year institutions, and 4 (12.5%) are two-year colleges. These figures suggest that as the number of graduate students employed as writing teachers increases, so do both the presence and required use of a first-semester/quarter and a second-semester/quarter syllabus (see note 15).

CHAPTER IV

STAFFING OF WRITING COURSES

The question of who teaches what in college writing programs has been raised by students and faculty and by parents and state legislators. From time to time, this question is at the center of heated debates about the quality of instruction in undergraduate writing courses, especially freshman composition. Our data will not settle the debate over the quality of instruction; they may or may not even contribute to it in contradictory ways. However, our data do permit us to develop a detailed and accurate picture of how many introductory and non-introductory composition classes of different kinds are taught by different faculty groups in different types of institutions. The item on our questionnaire which generated the data on staff distribution asked the directors to indicate how many sections of the various kinds of introductory and non-introductory courses are taught by each of four groups of faculty. These faculty groups are the following: (1) full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty (T-Track); (2) other full-time faculty (Full-Time); (3) part-time faculty (Part-Time); and (4) graduate students (Grad).

IV. 1. STAFFING OF INTRODUCTORY COURSES

Table IV.1 through Table IV.5 summarize our findings for the sections of introductory writing courses taught in our five types of institutions.

Intro Comp Courses	N of Sections	% Taught by Different Faculty			
		T-Track	Full-Time	Part-Time	Grad
Expos Wr	738	59.5	16.0	24.4	0.1
Lit & Crit Wr	261	43.7	27.6	28.7	---
Tech Wr	58	50.0	19.0	31.0	---
ESL	12	33.3	----	66.7	---
Remedial Wr	174	66.1	10.3	21.8	1.7
Other	11	45.5	54.5	----	---
TOTALS	1254	56.3	17.9	25.4	0.3

Table IV.1. Percentage of Sections of Introductory Writing Courses Taught by Different Faculty in Responding Two-Year Colleges (N = 14).

Intro Comp Courses	N of Sections	% Taught by Different Faculty			
		T-Track	Full-Time	Part-Time	Grad
Expos Wr	658	49.1	7.6	40.7	2.6
Lit & Crit Wr	173	78.6	8.1	13.3	---
Tech Wr	12	66.7	---	33.3	---
ESL	37	27.0	10.8	62.2	---
Remedial Wr	66	40.9	4.5	54.5	---
Other	98	76.5	6.1	17.3	---
TOTALS	1044	55.5	7.4	35.5	1.6

Table IV.2. Percentage of Sections of Introductory Writing Courses Taught by Different Faculty in Responding Private Four-Year Institutions (N = 32).

Intro Comp Courses	N of Sections	% Taught by Different Faculty			
		T-Track	Full-Time	Part-Time	Grad
Expos Wr	2117	47.9	15.4	16.2	20.6
Lit & Crit Wr	402	68.7	1.2	20.1	10.0
Tech Wr	61	82.0	6.6	8.2	3.3
ESL	84	10.7	8.3	81.0	----
Remedial Wr	493	34.7	7.5	37.7	20.1
Other	125	73.6	1.6	3.2	21.6
TOTALS	3282	49.1	11.6	20.9	18.4

Table IV.3. Percentage of Sections of Introductory Writing Courses Taught by Different Faculty in Responding Public Four-Year Institutions (N = 35).

Intro Comp Courses	N of Sections	% Taught by Different Faculty			
		T-Track	Full-Time	Part-Time	Grad
Expos Wr	946	13.21	3.07	37.84	45.88
Lit & Crit Wr	237	27.00	10.97	3.38	58.65
Tech Wr	12	33.33	41.67	16.67	8.33
ESL	53	30.19	-----	62.26	7.55
Remedial Wr	92	15.22	-----	36.96	47.83
Other	27	44.44	55.56	-----	-----
TOTALS	1367	17.19	5.49	31.82	45.50

Table IV.4. Percentage of Sections of Introductory Writing Courses Taught by Different Faculty in Responding Private Universities (N = 14).

Intro Comp Courses	N of Sections	% Taught by Different Faculty			
		T-Track	Full-Time	Part-Time	Grad
Expos Wr	4493	13.67	13.42	18.85	54.06
Lit & Crit Wr	2083	32.07	11.57	13.25	43.11
Tech Wr	186	10.75	1.61	22.58	65.06
ESL	104	6.73	13.46	9.62	70.19
Remedial Wr	571	15.59	17.34	19.79	47.29
Other	868	8.87	7.60	8.18	75.35
TOTALS	8305	17.76	12.35	16.36	53.52

Table IV.5. Percentage of Sections of Introductory Writing Courses Taught by Different Faculty in Responding Public Universities (N = 32).

Table IV.1 through IV.5 summarize the way different types of institutions staff their introductory courses in writing. One interesting finding is that tenured and tenure-track faculty teach relatively fewer introductory writing courses as one moves from Table IV.1 through Table IV.5. The percentages range from 56.3% of all sections of introductory courses in two-year colleges to 17.19% and 17.76% in private and public universities, respectively. In contrast, graduate students teach increasingly larger numbers of sections as one moves through the five tables from two-year colleges to public universities. In two-year colleges and private and public four-year institutions, graduate students teach 0.3%, 1.6%, and 18.4% of the sections, respectively; and in private and public universities they teach 45.5% and 53.52%, respectively. To some people, these differences may suggest that writing instruction in two-year colleges and in four-year schools is superior to that in private and public universities. However, we know of no hard evidence to suggest that tenured or tenure-track faculty in two-year colleges and four-year schools are better teachers than graduate students in private and public universities (see note 16).

Another interesting finding is that non-tenured, non-tenure track full-time faculty account for a good deal of the writing instruction that occurs at the introductory level. There is considerable variation across institutions with respect to the percentages of sections taught by this group, which range from 5.49% in private universities to 17.9% in two-year colleges. These faculty members frequently have little job security, often not knowing from one semester or year to the next whether they will be teaching at all. Also interesting is the percentage of sections of introductory writing taught by part-time faculty. The percentage for this class of faculty is lowest for public universities (16.36%) and highest for private universities (31.82%), while for two-year colleges and private and public

four-year institutions the percentages are 25.4%, 35.5%, and 20.9%, respectively. Part-time faculty--like non-tenured, non-tenure track full-time faculty--have little job security. But the two groups combined teach well over a third of the introductory sections in two-year colleges (43.3%), private four-year institutions (42.9%), and private universities (37.31%) and nearly one-third in public four-year institutions (32.5%) and in public universities (28.71%).

Tables IV.1 through IV.5 also show differences in the kinds of courses the various faculty groups most often teach. Except for two-year colleges, tenure-track faculty teach a relatively higher percentage of "introduction to literature and critical writing" sections than expository writing sections. The largest percentage (56.3%) of sections of "introduction to literature and critical writing" taught by full-time and part-time faculty is for two-year colleges; the next highest is for public universities with 24.92%. The percentages for the remaining types of schools range from 14.35% in private universities to about 21% in private and public four-year institutions. Graduate students teach the largest number of sections in private universities (58.65%), while they teach 43.11% in public universities and 10% in public four-year institutions.

The staffing of ESL courses and remedial writing courses varies considerably across institutional types. The tables indicate that, except in public universities, a good deal of such instruction is handled by part-time faculty and a fair amount by tenure-track faculty, except in private universities where the bulk of remedial instruction in writing is done by graduate students. Faculty in public universities teach relatively few of these courses, with the bulk of the instruction done by graduate students. Where a substantial number of technical writing classes are being taught--as in public four-year institutions and universities--they are staffed very differently, with 82% of the sections taught by "t-track" in public four-year institutions and 65.06% taught by graduate students in public universities.

IV. 2. STAFFING OF NON-INTRODUCTORY COURSES

Table IV.6 through Table IV.10 summarize the staff distributions across non-introductory writing courses in the five types of institutions we surveyed.

Non-Intro Comp Courses	N of Sections	% Taught by Different Faculty			
		T-Track	Full-Time	Part-Time	Grad
Expos Wr	14	57.1	21.4	21.4	---
Bus Wr	39	87.2	2.6	10.3	
Tech Wr	24	45.8	20.8	33.3	---
Art/Journ Wr	14	50.0	28.6	21.4	---
Creat Wr	27	88.9	7.4	3.7	---
Other	--	----	----	----	---
TOTALS	118	66.7	18.3	15.1	---

Table IV.6. Percentage of Sections of Non-Introductory Writing Courses Taught by Different Faculty in Responding Two-Year Colleges (N = 14).

Non-Intro Comp Courses	N of Sections	% Taught by Different Faculty			
		T-Track	Full-Time	Part-Time	Grad
Expos Wr	32	84.4	9.4	6.3	---
Bus Wr	53	73.6	----	26.4	---
Tech Wr	35	77.1	----	22.9	---
Art/Journ Wr	47	61.7	12.8	25.5	---
Creat Wr	54	79.6	11.1	9.3	---
Other	8	75.0	---	25.0	---
TOTALS	229	74.7	6.6	18.8	---

Table IV.7. Percentage of Sections of Non-Introductory Writing Courses Taught by Different Faculty in Responding Private Four-Year Institutions (N = 32).

Non-Intro Comp Courses	N of Sections	% Taught by Faculty Groups			
		T-Track	Full-Time	Part-Time	Grad
Expos Wr	298	46.6	43.0	9.7	0.7
Bus Wr	14	50.0	50.0	---	---
Tech Wr	108	87.0	12.0	0.9	---
Art/Journ Wr	6	68.3	19.0	12.7	---
Creat Wr	120	85.0	10.8	4.2	---
Other	82	28.0	1.2	40.2	30.5
TOTALS	685	59.6	25.4	11.1	3.9

Table IV.8. Percentage of Sections of Non-Introductory Writing Courses Taught by Different Faculty in Responding Public Four-Year Institutions (N = 35).

Non-Intro Comp Courses	N of Sections	% Taught by Faculty Groups			
		T-Track	Full-Time	Part-Time	Grad
Expos Wr	96	28.13	3.13	58.33	10.42
Bus Wr	34	41.18	2.94	47.06	8.82
Tech Wr	34	26.47	5.88	38.24	29.41
Art/Journ Wr	10	70.00	10.00	20.00	-----
Creat Wr	73	60.27	21.92	17.81	-----
Other	29	83.33	6.67	10.00	-----
TOTALS	276	45.49	9.03	37.18	8.30

Table IV.9. Percentage of Sections of Non-Introductory Writing Courses by Different Faculty in Responding Private Universities (N = 14).

Non-Intro Comp Courses	N of Sections	% Taught by Faculty Groups			
		T-Track	Full-Time	Part-Time	Grad
Expos Wr	465	53.98	7.31	14.41	24.30
Bus Wr	246	55.28	13.01	11.79	19.92
Tech Wr	407	36.86	20.64	18.92	23.59
Art/Journ Wr	37	81.08	13.51	5.41	-----
Creat Wr	329	59.88	13.07	3.95	23.10
Other	68	36.76	61.76	1.47	-----
TOTALS	1552	50.84	15.46	12.18	21.52

Table IV.10. Percentage of Sections of Non-Introductory Writing Courses Taught by Different Faculty in Responding Public Universities (N = 32).

Perhaps the most important finding, although not an unexpected one, revealed by these tables is that "t-track" faculty teach a significantly higher proportion of the sections of non-introductory writing courses than of introductory courses. The tables also indicate that the other faculty groups still teach a fair percentage of the non-introductory courses as well.

IV. 3. SUMMARY OF STAFFING ACROSS CURRICULAR LEVELS

Table IV.11 collapses the data for introductory and non-introductory courses summarized in Table IV.1 through Table IV.10 even more.

Level of Courses	% Taught by Faculty Groups				
	T-Track	Full-Time	Part-Time	Grad	TOTALS
Introductory	25.43	9.84	17.51	31.43	84.21
Non-Introductory	8.71	2.59	2.37	2.12	15.79
TOTALS	34.14	12.43	19.88	33.55	100.00

Table IV.11. Percentage of All Introductory and Non-Introductory Sections of Writing Courses Taught by Different Faculty Groups Across all Types of Institutions (N of Sections = 18,112).

As Table IV.11 reveals, when all sections of introductory and non-introductory writing courses are combined to form the base for calculating staffing percentages, "t-track" and graduate students are shown to teach 34.14% and 33.55%, respectively, of all sections of writing courses in our responding institutions. Together, "full-time" and "part-time" faculty teach the remaining 32.31%. What these figures mean is that 65.86% of all writing classes in the institutions we surveyed are taught by teachers who probably have only temporary appointments in their respective departments or colleges. These figures seem particularly important in light of the fact that in many institutions, composition classes account for at least 60% of all classes taught in English departments. These figures further suggest that while many schools may pay lip service to the teaching of writing, they have obviously not worked this "commitment" into their rewards systems.

IV. 4. SUMMARY OF STAFFING ACROSS LEVELS AND INSTITUTIONAL TYPES

Table IV.12, Table IV.13, and Table IV.14 summarize staff distributions at various curricular levels across types of institutions.

Level of Introductory Courses	% Taught by Faculty Groups				
	T-Track	Full-Time	Part-Time	Grad	TOTALS
Freshman	26.80	11.10	19.96	35.98	93.85
Sophomore	3.40	0.59	0.83	1.34	6.15
TOTALS	30.20	11.69	20.79	37.32	100.00

Table IV.12. Percentage of Sections of Introductory Writing Courses Taught by Different Faculty Groups Across All Responding Institutions (N of Sections = 15,252).

Level of Non-Introductory Courses	% Taught by Faculty Groups				
	T-Track	Full-Time	Part-Time	Grad	TOTALS
Freshman	10.87	1.57	1.92	0.90	15.28
Sophomore	12.10	6.57	4.97	7.27	30.91
Upper-Division	32.20	3.26	3.11	5.24	53.81
TOTALS	55.17	16.40	15.00	13.43	100.00

Table IV.13. Percentage of Sections of Non-Introductory Writing Courses Taught by Different Faculty Groups Across All Responding Institutions (N of Sections = 2,860).

Curricular Levels	% Taught by Faculty Groups				
	T-Track	Full-Time	Part-Time	Grad	TOTALS
Freshman	24.29	9.60	17.12	30.44	81.44
Sophomore	4.77	1.53	1.48	2.27	10.06
Upper-Division	5.08	1.30	1.28	0.83	8.50
TOTALS	34.14	12.43	19.88	33.55	100.00

Table IV.14. Percentage of Sections of Introductory and Non-Introductory Writing Courses Taught by Different Faculty Groups Across all Responding Institions (N of Sections = 18,112).

Table IV.12 shows that 93.85% of all sections of introductory composition courses are taught at the freshman level, while 6.15% of the sections of introductory composition are taught at the sophomore level. Of these sections, 30.2% are taught by "t-track" faculty and 37.32% are taught by graduate students. Table IV.13 indicates that "t-track" faculty teach the majority of non-introductory writing classes, with the other faculty groups teaching comparable numbers of sections. Table IV.14 presents the same staffing distributions as Table IV.11 but divides introductory and non-introductory classes across somewhat more specific curricular levels.

IV. 5. STAFFING WRITING COURSES: A NATIONAL PROJECTION

By using the data summarized in Table IV.1 through Table IV.14 and by transforming those data to reflect national enrollment patterns, we were able to project the percentages of all sections of writing which our four faculty groups teach nationally. These projections appear in Table IV.15.

Level of Sections	% Taught by Faculty Group				
	T-Track	Full-Time	Part-Time	Grad	TOTALS
Introductory	39.04	11.48	21.06	14.56	86.14
Non-Introductory	8.66	2.16	2.14	0.90	13.86
TOTALS	47.70	13.64	23.20	15.46	100.00

Table IV.15. Projected National Distribution of Sections of Introductory and Non-Introductory Writing Courses for All Institutional Types for Faculty in Different Groups.

When the figures appearing on the "totals" row in Table IV.15 are compared with those on the "totals" row in Table IV.11, we see that while 34.14% of all sections taught in our sample institutions are taught by "t-track" faculty, 47.70% nationally are taught by "t-track" faculty. The percentage of sections taught by "full-time" faculty increases (from 12.43% to 13.64) slightly, and those taught by "part-time" faculty increase (from 19.88% to 23.20%) somewhat more. In contrast, graduate students--who teach 33.55% of all sections in our responding institutions--teach a considerably smaller percentage (15.46%) of writing classes nationwide. These large differences between the real percentage for our sample and the projected national percentages for "t-track" faculty and graduate students are a function of the difference between the distribution of our sample institutions across institutional type and the national distribution of all schools across institutional types. As Table I.1 and Table I.2 in Chapter I indicate, 11.02% of our sample consists of two-year colleges, while nationally 38% of all institutions are two-year colleges. Similarly, while 36.22% of our responding institutions are universities, only 5.12% of all insitutions nationally are. The differences between the real and projected staffing distributions are thus explained by the fact that two-year colleges use virtually no graduate students as composition teachers while universities use extremely large numbers of them.

CHAPTER V

PROFICIENCY EXAMINATIONS AND EXEMPTION PRACTICES

Two important aspects of college writing programs are the means used to determine writing proficiency and the methods employed to exempt students from required composition courses.

V. 1. PROFICIENCY EXAMINATIONS

Although the use of proficiency examinations to determine student advancement from lower-division to upper-division status has probably declined since the mid 1960's, 56 (44.1%) of our responding institutions indicated that they use a general writing proficiency test of some kind to determine advancement through the undergraduate curriculum. In some cases, this examination takes the form of an exit examination for a particular writing course or sequence of writing courses. In other cases, the examination is used to determine whether students write at a level deemed appropriate for college graduates. This latter kind of examination is more specifically a graduation requirement than the former. Of our responding institutions, 24 (18.9%) use both proficiency and exit examinations, while 32 (25.2%) use one or the other. Of the 32 institutions relying on one or the other type of examination, 9 (28.1% of the 32; 7% of all institutions sampled) use a proficiency but not an exit examination, and 23 (71.9% of the 32; 18.1% of all institutions sampled) use exit examinations of some kind but not proficiency examinations. Although we did not design our questionnaire to elicit very specific information about these examinations, we believe that they should be examined systematically, if for no other reason than to identify the bases on which proficiency is determined. Another reason for studying such examinations systematically is that with the current importance attached to writing among college students and college graduates, the use of such examinations is likely to increase.

V. 2. EXEMPTION PRACTICES

With respect to the methods used to determine exemptions, our questionnaire yielded information somewhat more specific. Of the 127 responding institutions, 102 (80.3%) indicated that they have a procedure for exempting students from required writing

courses, usually those at the freshman level. We find it encouraging that 64 (63%) of the 102 directors answering this particular question said that their institutions use a writing sample, either alone or in conjunction with some other measure, to determine exemptions. Either to supplement or to replace writing samples, many institutions use "standardized" tests for exemption purposes. These percentages are as follows: 34%, Advanced Placement; 29%, ACT Verbal; 24%, other (often an in-house objective test of grammar and usage); 23%, CLEP with a writing sample; 23%, SAT Verbal; 16%, CLEP without a writing sample; 7%, ECT with a writing sample; 6%, TSWE; 3%, TOEFL; 2%, SAT Quantitative; and 2%, SAT Total Score.

With such "standardized" tests or combination of "standardized" test and writing sample, the responding institutions exempt on the average 10.39% (median = 2.65%; mode = 1.00%) of their students from at least one required freshman writing course. The average rate for exemptions from more than one required freshman writing course is 3.54% (median = 0.43%; mode = 0.00%). Finally, nearly 32% of the responding writing program directors said that their exemption procedures and policies were currently under study, suggesting that exemption practices ought to be studied again in the near future.

CHAPTER VI

FRESHMAN TEXTBOOKS

One fairly good, yet general, indication of the nature of a writing course is the type or types of textbooks adopted. For example, writing courses which rely most heavily on textbooks on grammar and usage are likely to differ in important ways from courses which rely most heavily on anthologies of short stories. To help construct a general picture of the nature of first- and second-semester/quarter freshman writing courses, we asked the writing program directors in our sample how extensively certain types of textbooks are used in their freshman writing courses. The types of textbooks we asked about specifically are the following: (1) the grammar and usage handbook (Gr/Usage Hdbk); (2) the sentence workbook (Sent Wrkbk); (3) the paragraph workbook (Paragr Wrkbk); (4) the anthology of nonfiction (Anthol: Nonfict); (5) the "how-to" style book (How-To Style Bk); (6) the anthology of fiction and/or poetry (Anthol: Fict/Poet); (7) the anthology of fiction and nonfiction (Anthol: Comb); (8) the classroom rhetoric with a handbook of usage (Rhet w/ Hdbk); and (9) the classroom rhetoric without a handbook of usage (Rhet w/o Hdbk). These textbook types were listed on our questionnaire, and the writing program directors were asked to indicate--on a four-point scale from "much use" to "no use"--the degree to which the nine types are used in their first-, second-, and third-semester/quarter freshman writing courses. Because of the large numbers of such courses, we focus here on only first- and second-semester/quarter courses.

VI. 1. FRESHMAN TEXTBOOK USE: ALL RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS

Of the 127 institutions represented in our sample, 117 provided information about the use of textbooks in first-semester/quarter freshman writing courses, and 88 supplied textbook information for second-semester/quarter freshman writing courses. The responses for all responding institutions are summarized in Table VI.1 and Table VI.2. These tables reflect the diversity of texts used in first- and second-semester/quarter freshman writing courses.

Type of Text	Much Use	Some Use	Little Use	No Use
Gr/Usage Hdbk	28.2	29.9	14.5	27.4
Sent Wrkbk	15.4	15.4	17.1	52.1
Paragr Wrkbk	6.0	12.8	10.3	70.9
Anthol:Nonfict	20.5	34.2	6.8	38.5
How-To Style Bk	3.4	18.8	8.5	69.2
Anthol:Fict/Poet	0.9	8.5	4.3	86.3
Anthol:Comb	5.1	6.0	7.7	81.2
Rhet w/ Hdbk	32.5	17.9	12.0	37.6
Rhet w/o Hdbk	20.5	17.1	6.0	56.4
Other	6.8	8.5	2.6	82.1

Table VI.1. Use (in % of responses in response categories) of Textbooks of Different Types in First-Semester/ Quarter Freshman Composition Courses in All Responding Institutions (N = 117).

Type of Text	Much Use	Some Use	Little Use	No Use
Gr/Usage Hdbk	10.2	45.5	12.5	31.8
Sent Wrkbk	6.8	8.0	9.1	76.1
Paragr Wrkbk	3.4	2.3	9.1	85.2
Anthol: Nonfict	29.5	30.7	4.5	35.2
How-to Style Bk	8.0	9.1	8.0	43.2
Anthol: Fict/Poet	17.0	9.1	4.5	69.3
Anthol: Comb	12.5	13.6	6.8	67.0
Rhet w/ Hdbk	17.0	22.7	13.6	46.6
Rhet w/o Hdbk	10.2	17.0	6.8	65.9
Other	9.1	8.0	1.1	81.8

Table VI.2. Use (in % of responses in response categories) of Textbooks of Different Types in Second-Semester/ Quarter Freshman Composition Courses in All Responding Institutions (N = 88).

VI. 1. 1. Use in First-Semester/Quarter Courses: All Schools

Table VI.1 indicates generally both what types of textbooks are and are not used in first-semester/quarter courses. For

these courses, at least 50% of the directors indicated that they make "no use" of the following kinds of textbooks: the sentence workbook (52.1%); the paragraph workbook (70.9%); the "how-to" style book (69. 2%); the anthology of fiction and/or poetry (86.3%); and the combination anthology (81.2%). These percentages suggest two important things about first-semester/quarter freshman writing courses in general. First, they suggest that first-semester/quarter courses are not usually literature-based. Less than 12% of the 117 directors said they make "much" or "some" use of a literature anthology or a "combination" anthology. Second, the percentages suggest that the study of sentences, paragraphs, and style in isolation does not figure importantly in the first-semester/quarter courses, even though over 30% of the directors indicate "much" or "some" use of a sentence workbook. The relatively high percentage (56.4%) of directors indicating "no use" of a classroom rhetoric without a handbook is somewhat misleading. A more detailed analysis of the data showed that 88% of the directors make "much" or "some" use of one or the other type of classroom rhetorics in first-semester/quarter freshman writing courses. Thus a third important finding is that generally first-semester/quarter freshman writing courses make "much" or "some" use of a classroom rhetoric. Table VI.1 also reveals that 54.7% of the directors make "much" or "some" use of a nonfiction reader and that 58.1% make "much" or "some" use of a grammar and usage handbook in the first-semester/quarter courses they direct. Thus it would appear that first-semester/quarter freshman writing courses generally rely on some form of classroom rhetoric, some kind of grammar and usage handbook, and an anthology of nonfiction readings.

Responses contained in the "other" category of textbooks, which appears in Table VI.1 through VI.8, are from directors who named texts in addition to the types listed on the questionnaire. For the most part, these directors indicated that the students' own papers serve as a "text" for the course. This response may have occurred more frequently if we had included it on our list of possible responses.

VI. 1. 2. Use in Second-Semester/Quarter Course: All Schools

Comparison of Table VI.1 and Table VI.2 suggests that in some ways the first- and second-semester/quarter freshman writing courses are similar but that in other important ways they are different. The percentage of directors indicating "no use" of sentence and paragraph workbooks increases across the tables from 52.1% to 76.1% and from 70.9% to 85.2%, respectively. Classroom rhetorics of both types are also less used in the second courses, while the use of the literature anthology, the combination anthology, the nonfiction anthology, and the style book increases. The heavier reliance on the literature and the combination anthologies suggests that second-semester/quarter freshman writing courses tend to be more dependent on readings,

perhaps literary, than are first-semester/quarter courses. Nevertheless, the use of classroom rhetorics, while less than in first-semester/quarter courses, is substantial, with 66.9% of the directors indicating "much" or "some" use and 87.3% indicating at least a "little" use. Finally, the reliance on a grammar and usage handbook is at about the same level in the second-semester/quarter courses as in the first.

VI. 2. TEXTBOOK USE BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE IN FIRST-SEMESTER/QUARTER COURSES

Table VI.3, Table VI.4, and Table VI.5 divide the data summarized in Table VI.1 according to institutional types. The rationale for so dividing the data was that differences in textbook use across institutional types might reflect important differences in the goals of the writing programs in general and of first-semester/quarter freshman writing courses in particular.

Type of Text	Much Use	Some Use	Little Use	No Use
Gr/Usage Hdbk	64.3	28.6	35.7	7.1
Sent Wrkbk	7.1	7.1	21.4	64.3
Paragr Wrkbk	----	21.4	21.4	57.1
Anthol: Nonfict	14.3	35.7	7.1	42.9
How-To Style Bk	14.3	21.4	7.1	57.1
Anthol:Fict/Poet	7.1	7.1	7.1	78.6
Anthol:Comb	7.1	----	7.1	85.7
Rhet w/ Hdbk	57.1	7.1	14.3	21.4
Rhet w/o Hdbk	21.4	28.6	21.4	28.6
Other	----	7.1	7.1	85.7

Table VI.3. Use (in % of responses in response categories) of Textbooks of Different Types in First-Semester/Quarter Freshman Composition Courses in Responding Two-Year Colleges (N = 14).

Type of Text	Much Use	Some Use	Little Use	No Use
Gr/Usage Hdbk	31.7	25.0	13.3	30.0
Sent Wrkbk	18.3	20.0	13.3	48.3
Paragr Wrkbk	10.0	16.7	8.3	65.0
Anthol:Nonfict	13.3	36.7	6.7	43.3
How-To Style Bk	3.3	20.0	10.0	66.7
Anthol:Fict/Poet	----	6.7	5.0	88.3
Anthol:Comb	5.0	5.0	8.3	81.7
Rhet w/ Hdbk	25.0	13.3	16.7	45.0
Rhet w/o Hdbk	16.7	15.0	6.7	61.7
Other	8.3	3.3	1.7	86.7

Table VI.4. Use (in % of responses in response categories) of Textbooks of Different Types in First-Semester/ Quarter Freshman Composition Courses in Responding Four-Year Institutions (N = 60).

Type of Text	Much Use	Some Use	Little Use	No Use
Gr/Usage Hdbk	23.3	34.9	11.6	30.2
Sent Wrkbk	14.0	11.6	20.9	30.2
Paragr Wrkbk	2.3	4.7	9.3	83.7
Anthol:Nonfict	32.6	30.2	7.0	30.2
How-To Style Bk	----	16.3	7.0	76.7
Anthol:Fict/Poet	----	11.6	2.3	86.0
Anthol:Comb	4.7	9.3	7.0	79.1
Rhet w/ Hdbk	34.9	27.9	4.7	32.6
Rhet w/o Hdbk	25.6	16.3	32.6	25.6
Other	7.0	16.3	2.3	74.4

Table VI.5. Use (in % of responses in response categories) of Textbooks of Different Types in First-Semester/ Quarter Freshman Composition Courses in Responding Universities (N = 43).

These tables suggest that first-semester/quarter freshman writing courses differ considerably according to type of school. While first-semester/quarter courses in all three types of institutions rely rather heavily on a grammar and usage handbook, the two-year colleges in our sample used them the most, as much or more than they used classroom rhetoric. Both two-year colleges and universities seem to rely more heavily on classroom rhetorics of either type than do four-year institutions.

Four-year institutions, on the other hand, rely more heavily on sentence and paragraph workbooks than do either two-year colleges or universities. Two-year colleges appear to make heavier use of style books than do either universities or four-year institutions.

VI. 3. TEXTBOOK USE BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE IN SECOND-SEMESTER/ QUARTER COURSES

Table VI.6, Table VI.7, and Table VI.8 take the data summarized in Table VI.2 and divide it according to institutional types.

Type of Text	Much Use	Some Use	Little Use	No Use
Gr/Usage Hdbk	----	54.5	27.3	18.2
Sent Wrkbk	----	----	----	100.0
Paragr Wrkbk	----	----	----	100.0
Anthol:Nonfict	9.1	27.3	----	63.6
How-To Style Bk	18.2	----	----	81.8
Anthol:Fict/Poet	45.5	9.1	9.1	36.4
Anthol:Comb	18.2	36.4	----	45.5
Rhet w/ Hdbk	9.1	9.1	9.1	72.7
Rhet w/o Hdbk	----	9.1	----	90.9
Other	----	----	----	100.0

Table VI.6. Use (in % of responses in response categories) of Textbooks of Different Types in Second-Semester/ Quarter Courses in Responding Two-Year Colleges (N = 11).

Type of Text	Much Use	Some Use	Little Use	No Use
Gr/Usage Hdbk	21.4	33.3	9.5	35.7
Sent Wrkbk	11.9	7.1	7.1	73.8
Paragr Wrkbk	7.1	4.8	11.9	76.2
Anthol:Nonfict	26.2	35.7	4.8	33.3
How-To Style Bk	9.5	11.9	11.9	66.7
Anthol:Fict/Poet	9.5	14.3	4.8	71.4
Anthol:Comb	14.3	16.7	7.1	61.9
Rhet w/ Hdbk	11.9	26.2	16.7	45.2
Rhet w/o Hdbk	11.9	16.7	9.5	61.9
Other	14.3	7.1	----	78.6

Table VI.7. Use (in % of responses in response categories) of Textbooks of Different Types in Second-Semester/ Quarter Courses in Responding Four-Year Institutions (N = 42).

Type of Text	Much Use	Some Use	Little Use	No Use
Gr/Usage Hdbk	----	57.1	11.4	31.4
Sent Wrkbk	2.9	11.4	14.3	71.4
Paragr Wrkbk	----	----	8.6	91.4
Anthol:Nonfict	40.0	25.7	5.7	28.6
How-To Style Bk	2.9	8.6	5.7	82.9
Anthol:Fict/Poet	17.1	2.9	2.9	77.1
Anthol:Comb	8.6	2.9	8.6	80.0
Rhet w/ Hdbk	25.7	22.9	11.4	40.0
Rhet w/o Hdbk	11.4	20.0	5.7	62.9
Other	5.7	11.4	2.9	80.0

Table VI.8. Use (in % of responses in response categories) of Textbooks of Different Types in Second-Semester/ Quarter Freshman Composition Courses in Responding Universities (N = 35).

These tables reveal some rather remarkable differences across the second-semester/quarter freshman writing courses taught in the three types of schools. The most obvious similarity, and perhaps the only one, across the three types of schools is in the use of a grammar and usage handbook, which is about the same for all three types of institutions. More noticeable are the differences across the three types of schools. While Table VI.6 reveals that sentence and paragraph workbooks

are not used at all in the responding two-year colleges, Table VI.7 shows that 30.9% of the four-year schools make "much" or "some" use of paragraph and sentence workbooks and Table VI.8 indicates that 14.3% of the universities make similar use of a paragraph workbook. These figures suggest that attention to discourse particles such as the sentence and the paragraph is greatest in the second-semester/quarter courses taught in four-year institutions and least in those taught in two-year colleges.

The differences across the types of schools in their respective uses of literature anthologies and anthologies which combine literature and nonfiction are also important. Of the second-semester/quarter courses in two-year colleges, 54.6% make "much" or "some" use of a literature anthology and 54.6% make "much" or "some" use of a "combination" anthology. In four-year institutions, the percentages are considerably smaller--23.8% for literature anthologies and 31.0% for "combination" anthologies. And in unversities, the percentages are even smaller still--20% for literature anthologies and 11.5% for "combination" anthologies. Complementary differences across the three types of institutions appear for the use of nonfiction anthologies. In the responding two-year colleges, only 36.4% of the second-semester/quarter freshman writing courses make "much" or "some" use of a nonfiction anthology. The percentages are progressively higher for four-year institutions and universities, with 51.9% of the courses in four-year institutions and 65.7% of the courses in universities making "much" or "some" use of a nonfiction anthology.

These percentages may indicate that the two-year colleges have the most literature-oriented second-semester course and that the universities emphasize literature the least or, perhaps, postpone it until after the freshman year. The differences across the types of institutions with respect to the use of anthologies are similarly reflected in the respective uses of classroom rhetorics, with or without handbooks, in the second-semester/quarter courses. Of these courses, 18.2% in the two-year colleges, 38.1% in the four-year institutions, and 48.6% in the universities make "much" or "some" use of a classroom rhetoric with a handbook; and 9.1% of these courses in the two-year colleges, 26.6% in the four-year colleges, and 31.4% in the universities make "much" or "some" use of a classroom rhetoric without a handbook.

The differences across institutional types revealed by Table VI.6, VI.7, and VI.8 must be viewed with caution, because of the small number of responding two-year institutions. If our examination of the use of textbooks in our responding two-year institutions revealed is typical of all two-year colleges, then it is safe to say that two-year colleges teach second-semester/quarter courses that are very different from those taught in four-year institutions and universities. But the difference, if reflected nationally, is perhaps explainable as follows: in two-year colleges the only opportunity many faculty

have to teach literature likely arises in a second-semester/quarter writing course. In many two-year colleges, degree programs allow for a very limited number of credit hours in English; and it seems to us possible that, if literature is to be taught at all, it would have to be taught in the second-semester/quarter freshman writing course.

CHAPTER VII

ACTIVITIES IN FRESHMAN WRITING COURSES

Textbooks may give a rather good, if limited, indication of the general nature of a composition course. However, textbooks do not necessarily give a clear indication of the specific instructional and curricular activities which make up the course. Hence we attempted to find out, from the point of view of the writing program directors we surveyed, which activities occur most frequently in the freshman courses they direct. Their perceptions were identified through two sets of items. One set of items focused on a wide range of possible instructional and curricular activities, and the other focused specifically on the types of writing assigned. This latter set of items sought to elicit information about the kinds of writing done in freshman courses and about the amount of writing of different kinds students are asked to do.

VII. 1. SURVEY OF INSTRUCTIONAL AND CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

To determine which specific classroom activities are used most and least often in first- and second-semester/quarter freshman writing courses, we presented the directors in our sample with a list of 38 possible instructional and curricular activities. Because we were interested in differences across semesters or quarters, we used only the responses of the 84 directors who responded to the list of items for courses taught during both semesters. The directors were asked to indicate along a five-point scale from "not at all" (1) to "very often" (5) how frequently those activities occur in their freshman writing courses. It should be noted that the five-point scale elicited responses which are somewhat ambiguous: a particular instructional or curricular activity may be very important within a particular course, but may actually occur only once or twice during the term. Although we collected data on first-, second-, and third-semester/quarter courses, only a small number of institutions furnished information about third-semester/quarter courses, thus limiting the value of summary statistics. Consequently, we focus on first- and second-semester/quarter freshman writing courses in the following paragraphs.

Table VII.1 and Table VII.2 summarize the results of our survey across all types of institutions. As stated above, directors indicated along a five-point scale how often the listed instructional and curricular activities occurred in their first-

and second-semester/quarter freshman courses. In Table VII.1 and Table VII.2 both means and variances are reported for each of the 38 activities. The variances indicate the amount of variation across the five response categories. The closer the variance is to zero, the greater the agreement among the respondents.

Table VII.1 summarizes the responses for items where the mean response is greater than about 3.5. Thus only those activities which occur markedly more often than "occasionally" in one of the two courses are listed in Table VII.1. Table VII.2 summarizes the responses to items for which the mean response was "occasionally" or less than about 3.3.

Activities	First-Semester Course		Second-Semester Course	
	Mean	Var	Mean	Var
Disc Essay Devel	4.25	0.84	4.27	0.76
Disc Topic/Thesis Sent	4.24	0.91	3.84	1.09
Disc Essay Org	4.22	0.87	4.24	0.82
Disc Revision/Editing	4.20	0.61	4.11	0.75
Disc Paragr Devel	4.06	0.78	3.69	0.92
Disc Invention Strat	4.06	0.91	3.52	1.18
Disc Paragr Org	3.99	0.75	3.50	0.94
Having Students Comment on Others' Wr	3.84	0.91	3.56	0.97
Doing Prewriting	3.83	1.03	3.21	1.30
Disc Mechanics	3.81	0.87	3.22	0.79
Doing In-Class Wr	3.67	0.98	3.38	1.04
Analyzing Audiences	3.48	1.06	3.43	1.14
Teaching Stand Usage	3.48	1.19	3.20	1.21
Teacher-Dir Oral Anal of Student Wr	3.35	0.95	3.30	0.95
Developing Library Sk	2.80	1.06	3.54	1.42
Writing Research Papers	2.25	2.14	3.55	2.03

Table VII.1. Activities Occurring More than Occasionally in First-Semester/Quarter and Second-Semester/ Quarter Freshman Writing Courses in 84 Responding Institutions.

Activities	First-Semester Course		Second-Semester Course	
	Mean	Var	Mean	Var
Doing SC Ex	3.06	1.03	2.24	1.03
Disc Rhet Theory	3.00	1.49	2.92	1.17
Doing Journal Wr	2.87	1.08	2.38	1.33
Doing Oral Anal of Publ Essays	2.82	1.24	2.89	1.55
Doing Free Wr	2.82	0.97	2.31	1.05
Doing Peer Tutoring	2.80	1.68	2.55	1.46
Disc Journal Wr	2.75	1.11	2.39	1.12
Doing SBuild Ex	2.61	1.27	2.06	0.98
Doing Wr Anal of Publ Essays	2.57	1.26	2.79	1.64
Abstracting Wr Texts	2.46	1.30	3.14	1.28
Pract Read Compr Sk	2.44	1.31	2.62	1.56
Doing SImitat Ex	2.32	1.05	1.88	0.73
Doing Vocab Ex	2.15	0.84	1.97	0.83
Making Oral Presen	2.11	1.13	2.42	1.15
Anal Non-Print Media	1.94	0.94	2.15	0.99
Wr Letters	1.94	1.08	1.84	1.04
Disc Linguistics	1.80	0.78	1.74	0.73
Doing Sent Anal	1.79	0.65	1.57	0.56
Doing Wr Anal of Fict/ Poetry	1.71	0.93	2.61	2.36
Wr in Spec Formats	1.70	0.95	1.86	1.08
Doing Oral Anal of Fict/Poetry	1.68	0.91	2.54	2.30
Wr Fict/Poetry	1.35	0.48	1.53	0.75

Table VII.2. Activities Occurring Infrequently in First-Semester/Quarter and Second-Semester/Quarter Writing Courses in 84 Responding Institutions.

Table VII.1 shows which activities writing program directors believe occur most frequently in their first- and second-semester/quarter freshman writing courses. The most frequently occurring activity is discussing essay development. With means of 4.25 and 4.27, this activity reportedly occurs more than "often" but less than "very often" in both courses. At the other extreme, in first-semester/quarter courses, writing research papers--with a mean of 2.25--occur only "rarely." However, this activity, with a mean of 3.55, occurs more than "occasionally" in second-semester/quarter courses. As is true in the case of writing research papers, Table VII.1 gives a good indication of the general shift in emphasis from first- to second-semester/quarter courses as well as showing the relative frequencies with which these activities occur. For the most

part, the differences revealed in Table VII.1 across the two courses are not unexpected ones. Developing library skills, like writing research papers, occurs more often in second- than in first-semester/quarter courses. While writing research papers and developing library skills increases from one course to the next, discussing mechanics, discussing invention strategies, and doing prewriting appear to decrease most significantly.

While the means reported in Table VII.1 show group tendencies, the variances reflect the diversity in instructional and curricular activities among the responding institutions with respect to any given activity. Variances indicate the spread of the responses across the five response categories. The larger variance, the greater the diversity in the responses. If a mean response of 3.0 had a variance of 0.0, the variance would indicate that all responses were 3's. On the other hand, if the mean response were 3.0 and the variance were 4.0, the variance would indicate that half of the responses were 1's and half were 5's. For example, the large variance for writing research papers indicates that some programs do research papers in the first-semester/quarter course, some in the second-, and many other "not at all" in either course. In addition, the variances seem particularly important for developing library skills, doing prewriting, and teaching standard usage.

Table VII.2 list the remaining instructional and curricular activities listed on our questionnaire. These activities were reported to occur, at most, only "occasionally," as indicated by the means in Table VII.2. Large variances reported in the table indicate activities that, while generally infrequent when all institutions are considered, still occur fairly "often" in a significant number of institutions. Two of these activities are doing written analyses of fiction or poetry and doing oral analyses of the same. The variances (2.36 and 2.30) for these activities indicate that-as our analyses of textbook use revealed-- significant minority of programs put substantial emphasis on literary analysis in their second-semester/quarter freshman writing courses. As Table VII.2 shows, other activities with large variances are doing peer tutoring, practicing reading comprehension skills, doing oral and written analyses of published essays, and discussing rhetorical theory. Again, such large variances indicate considerable spread in the emphasis institutions place on these activities.

Other comparisons can be made if activities listed separately are grouped together. Two examples will illustrate. The three activities which may be associated with prewriting--discussing journal writing, doing journal writing, and doing free writing--all occur less often in second-semester/quarter freshman writing courses than in first. Similarly, the four activities associated with sentences--doing sentence-combining exercises, sentence-imitation exercises, sentence-building exercises, and sentence analyses--all occur less often in second-semester/quarter courses than in first.

We also examined the occurrence of these instructional and curricular activities by type of institution and by source of funding. However, in those data we failed to indicate any important differences. Those differences which did appear were relatively small, with the means across institutional types and source of funding differing by usually less than 10%. Even the small differences which did appear were unsystematic.

VII. 2. SURVEY OF ESSAY WRITING

The amount and kinds of writing assigned in freshman writing courses have long been of interest to writing program directors and writing teachers. The reasons for this interest are certainly many, but three probably hold sway over the others. First, the number of student papers submitted during a writing course affects the number of evaluations the teacher must perform and probably the quality of those evaluations as well. Second, evaluation of student writing is for many teachers the most time-consuming aspect of teaching college writing and, for writing program directors, the source of many complaints lodged against teachers. Third, the amount and kinds of writing that students are required to do contribute significantly to how particular writing courses may be defined.

With our survey instrument, we tried to find out how much writing is done and what kinds of writing are being done in freshman writing courses. Although we collected data on first-, second-, and third-semester/quarter courses, the relatively small number of responses for third-semster/quarter courses has forced us to limit our report to first- and second-semester/quarter courses.

VII. 2. 1. Total Number of Pages Written

Table VII.3 reports the means and standard deviations for the total number of pages written in first- and second-semester/quarter freshman writing courses in all types of institutions. The responding directors were asked to indicate how many pages, of 150 words each, that their students are required to write in each course.

Type of Institution	First Course N	Mean	SD	Second Course N	Mean	SD
Two-Year	11	33.5	11.7	10	31.4	11.3
Four-Year Pri	23	30.3	17.1	20	33.7	20.0
Four-Year Pub	25	33.9	16.9	21	33.5	16.5
Univ Pri	11	35.4	12.2	8	39.5	13.1
Univ Pub	30	41.7	21.6	26	45.1	20.9
ALL	100	35.5	17.8	85	37.4	21.5

Table VII.3. Mean Number of Pages Written in First- and Second-Semester/Quarter Freshman Writing Courses in Different Types of Institutions (N = 100).

Table VII.3 shows some interesting differences both across types of institutions and across the two courses with respect to the total number of pages written. For both courses, universities, whether private or public, require students to write a larger number of pages than either two-year colleges or four-year institutions. Of all types of institutions, public universities require the largest number of pages. Public universities require approximately 27% more pages in first-semester/quarter freshman writing courses than four-year private institutions, the class of institutions requiring the lowest number of pages in first-semester/quarter courses; and they require 30% more pages in second-semester/quarter courses than do two-year colleges, the class requiring the lowest number of pages in second-semester/quarter courses. Across the two courses, the number of pages increases for private four-year institutions and for private and public universities, while it decreases for two-year colleges and for four-year private schools.

The standard deviations reported in Table VII.3 are perhaps as important as the means. What the standard deviations indicate is that there is considerable variation in the number of pages required within institutional type across semesters.

The means reported in Table VII.3 for the number of pages written at the various types of institutions for first- and second-semester/quarter freshman writing courses can be converted to total number of words. When this conversion is made for both courses for all institutions surveyed, we see that on the average 5,325 words are required in first-semester/quarter courses and that 5,610 are required in second-semester/quarter courses. This difference amounts to only about 5%.

We would be remiss if we did not indicate what we think the responding directors included and did not include in the figures they gave us for total number of pages written. Although we have

no way of knowing for certain, we assume that the figures include, for the most part, only those pages submitted as original, extended pieces of writing, such as essays and journals. The figures probably do not generally include pages written as "first drafts," "revisions" of graded work, or short assignments such as "topic sentence" exercises or sentence-combining exercies. In short, the means reported in Table VII.3 probably represent a conservative estimate of the amount of writing actually done in first- and second-semester/quarter freshman writing courses.

VII. 2. 2. Total Number of "Papers" Written: Purposes and Method(s) of Development

In addition to trying to arrive at a general estimate of how many pages are being written in first- and second-semester/quarter freshman writing courses, we also tried to elicit response which would yield an estimate of how many "papers" are generally required that exhibit certain purposes and certain methods or modes of development. To elicit such information, we formulated questions based on certain taxonomic distinctions among both writing purposes and methods of development. For writing purposes, we adopted the following classes: to entertain, to express oneself, to persuade, to inform, to prove a thesis, and to explore a problem. This taxonomy derives primarily from the theoretical work of James L. Kinneavy (see note 17). Not all readers will find this classification system satisfactory; neither did all the writing program directors in our sample. For methods of development, we employed a classification system which might best be represented as a conflation of two theories, Frank J. D'Angelo's (see note 18) and Kinneavy's (see note 19). The methods of development we listed on our questionnaire were the following: narration, process, cause and effect, evaluation/criticism, description, definition, analysis, classification, exemplification, and comparison/contrast. In addition, we included two "catchall" categories--"combinations of various methods" and "unspecified methods." Some readers will likely object to our taxonomy of methods of development, as did some of the writing program directors we surveyed.

Although the classification systems we used for writing purposes and for methods of development are probably less than perfect, we believed them suitable for giving a general indication of the kinds of writing done in first- and second-semester/quarter freshman writing courses. Accordingly, we asked the responding directors "how many major assignments/papers" with a particular dominant purpose students in their first- and second-semester/quarter freshman writing courses are required to write. In a subsequent question, we asked them to indicate "how many assignments/papers" students are required to write using the methods of development specified. The mean number of "papers" reported for writing purposes is less

than the mean number of "papers" for methods of development. This difference is probably attributable to the directors having to distribute the same number of papers into more categories for the question on methods of development than for the question on purposes. This difference is possibly attributable, in part, to our use of the word "major" as a modifier of "assignments/papers" in the question on purposes, a qualifier which did not appear in the question on methods of development.

VII. 2. 2. a. First-Semester/Quarter Courses

Purposes. Table VII.4 summarizes the responses to our question on writing purposes of "papers" written for first-semester/quarter courses across types of institutions.

Writing Purposes	Mean No. of Papers Written in First-Semester Freshman Writing Courses							
	2-Year (N=11)		4-Year (N=53)		Univ (N=34)		ALL (N=98)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Entertain	0.18	0.41	0.40	0.89	0.29	0.76	0.34	0.80
Express	1.28	1.56	1.50	1.87	1.09	1.98	1.33	1.87
Persuade	0.55	0.69	0.90	1.08	1.68	2.31	1.12	1.64
Inform	1.00	1.18	1.91	2.15	1.73	1.85	1.75	1.97
Prove	1.73	2.41	1.77	2.15	1.97	2.20	1.84	2.17
Explore	0.09	0.30	0.85	2.17	0.85	1.42	0.77	1.81
Other	0.36	0.67	0.36	2.07	0.03	0.17	0.25	1.54
TOTAL # of PAPERS	5.19		7.69		7.64		7.52	

Table VII.4. Mean Number of "Papers" Having Different Purposes Written in First-Semester/Quarter Freshman Writing Courses.

While our comments focus generally on the means reported in Table VII.4, readers should be aware that considerable variation, as indicated by the standard deviations, can be found within the responses themselves. Nevertheless, Table VII.4 suggests some important differences with respect to the number of "papers" written for particular purposes in first-semester/quarter courses in different types of institutions. Considerably more

"persuasive" writing is required in universities than in either two-year colleges or four-year institutions. Although all types of institutions require on average at least one "expressive paper," the most "expressive" writing seems to occur in four-year institutions. Similarly, at least one "informative" paper is required in all types of schools, but four-year institutions and universities require on the average nearly two. Almost the same number of "papers" whose purpose is "to prove a thesis" is required in all types of institutions. These four types of "papers" make up the bulk of the "papers" required in all types of institutions. In two-year colleges, those four types collectively account for 4.56 of the 5.19 "papers" required, or 88% of the total. In four-year institutions, they account for 6.08 of the 7.69 "papers" required, or 79% of the total number required. In universities, the four types of "papers" make up 6.47 of the 7.64 "papers" required, or 85% of the total. Thus it would seem that "papers" whose purposes are "to express," "to persuade," "to inform," and "to prove" constitute major emphases in first-semester/quarter freshman writing courses. Table VII.4 also reveals that four-year institutions and universities require on the average about 33% more papers than do two-year institutions.

Methods of Development. Our analyses of the data we collected on methods of development revealed only a few important differences across methods within types of institutions and only a few interpretable differences for different methods across types of institutions. The relatively small number of noteworthy differences is probably attributable to the larger number of possibilities listed under methods of development, 12 compared to the 6 listed under purposes. All types of institutions require about the same number of "papers" (mean no. of "papers" of each type is < 0.70) using "process," "description," "analysis," "exemplification," and "comparison/contrast" as the principal method of development. More "papers" using primarily "narration" and "evaluation/criticism" are required in four-year institutions than in other types of schools. Two-year institutions require more "papers" developed primarily through "classification," while both two-year and four-year schools require more "cause and effect" "papers" than do universities. "Definition" "papers" are required more often in two-year colleges and universities than in four-year institutions. "Papers" employing a combination of methods are required much more often in four-year institutions and universities than in two-year colleges, and "papers" with urspecified methods of development are required much more often in two-year colleges than in the other two types of institutions.

Our survey of methods of development used in "papers" indicated that on the average two-year colleges require a total of about 8 "papers," four-year institutions a total of about 9 "papers," and universities between 7 and 8 "papers." Of the approximately 8 "papers" required on the average in two-year colleges, about 2 either use a combination of methods of development or unspecified methods. Of the approximately 9 "papers" written in four-year institutions, the number using a

combination of methods or unspecified methods is only a fraction smaller; and for the approximately 8 "papers" written in universities, the number is a fraction larger than 2. The differences between these means for the number of "papers" and those listed in Table VII.4 result from the difficulties the responding directors experienced in trying to divide the total number of papers across 12 categories rather than 6.

VII. 2. 2. b. Second-Semester/Quarter Courses

Purposes. Table VII.5 summarizes the directors' responses to our question on writing purposes in second-semester/quarter courses. While our comments here are based primarily on the means reported in Table VII.5, the reader should again be aware of the sometimes large variations within the set of responses, as indicated by the standard deviations.

Writing Purposes	Mean No. of Papers Written in Second-Semester Freshman Writing Courses							
	2-Year (N=7)		4-Year (N=38)		Univ (N=27)		ALL (N=72)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Entertain	----	----	0.05	0.23	0.19	0.62	0.10	0.42
Express	0.29	0.76	0.66	1.48	0.33	0.56	0.50	1.15
Persuade	0.71	1.25	0.90	1.37	0.82	1.33	0.85	1.
Inform	0.43	1.13	1.40	2.07	1.15	1.59	1.21	1.83
Prove	1.29	0.84	1.18	1.50	1.63	2.39	1.36	1.93
Explore	0.57	1.51	0.47	0.86	0.78	1.25	0.60	1.08
Other	0.14	0.38	0.08	0.27	----	----	0.06	0.23
TOTAL # OF PAPERS	3.43		4.74		4.90		4.68	

Table VII.5. Mean Number of "Papers" Having Different Purposes Written in Second-Semester/Quarter Freshman Writing Courses.

When we compare Table VII.4 with Table VII.5, we find that the number of "papers" required in all institutions is about 38% less in second-semester/quarter courses than in first, 4.68 "papers" compared with 7.52. Table VII.5 reveals that the bulk of the "papers" written in second-semester/quarter courses have as their dominant purpose either to persuade, to inform, or to prove. In two-year colleges, 71% of the "papers" have one or the

other of these three purposes as the dominant purpose, and 73% of the "papers" in four-year institutions and universities do. "Papers" written primarily to entertain figure even less importantly in second-semester/quarter courses than in first. While "expressive" "papers" are relatively important in first-semester/quarter courses, they are somewhat less important in second-semester/quarter freshman writing courses.

Methods of Development. In interpreting the data on "papers" requiring different methods of development in second-semester/quarter courses, we experience difficulties similar to those encountered for first-semester/quarter courses. However, we can say that "papers" using "narration," "definition," "analysis," and "classification" as the principal method of development are required in about the same proportion to total "papers" in second-semester/quarter courses as in first. The percentages of total "papers" represented by those exhibiting combinations of methods or unspecified methods is somewhat different in second-semester/quarter courses than in first. The percentage for two-year colleges, four-year institutions, and universities are about 33%, 30%, and 24%, respectively.

CHAPTER VIII

EVALUATING STUDENTS IN FRESHMAN WRITING COURSES

One important aspect of most writing courses and, *mutatis mutandis*, most writing programs is the source or sources of evaluations of student performance. Although we might have focused exclusively on techniques used to evaluate writing, such as holistic scoring and primary trait scoring, the difficulties inherent in eliciting such information precluded our doing so. We decided instead to focus on the general sources of evaluation used in determining student grades in freshman writing courses. We asked writing program directors to rank order the five most important sources of evaluations used to determine students' final grades in first-, second-, and third-semester/quarter freshman writing courses. The list we included in our questionnaire contained the following sources of data used in determining students' final grades: (1) objective tests of usage (Usage Test); (2) tests over assigned readings (Readings Test); (3) tests over class lectures (Lectures Tests); (4) non-essay homework assignments (Homework); (5) participation and attendance (Part & Att); (6) in-class graded essays (IC Essay); (7) peer evaluation (Peer Eval); and (8) final examination (Final Exam). Under "final examination" three options were listed: (a) final graded essay; (b) essay plus objective test; and (c) objective test. One very important source of evaluation--the out of class essay (OC Essay)--was inadvertantly omitted from our list. However, since that item was written in under an "other" category by 81 of the 97 directors who completed this section of the questionnaire, we have included it in Table VIII.1 and Table VIII.2 below. Because the out-of-class essay is such an important aspect, we have used only the responses of those directors who wrote it in under the "other" category.

Although we collected data for first-, second-, and third-semester/quarter freshman writing courses, we received so few responses for third-semester/quarter courses, that in the following sections we focus only on sources of evaluations used in first- and second-semester/quarter freshman writing courses.

VIII. 1. EVALUATION IN FIRST-SEMESTER/QUARTER FRESHMAN WRITING COURSES

Table VIII.1 summarizes the average ranks assigned by the writing program directors to the various sources of evaluations used to arrive at final grades in first-semester/quarter freshman writing courses. The sources of evaluation listed in Table

VIII.1 are listed in order of the ranks assigned by all responding directors regardless of type of institution. The responses for all directors are summarized in column one and can easily be compared to the responses, which are listed in subsequent columns, for directors from different types of institutions. It should be noted that the means reported in Table VIII.1 and Table VIII.2 are based on a five-point scale, ranging from "1" (most important) to "5" (least important).

Source of Evaluation	Average Rankings ALL (N=81)	Two-Year (N=8)	Four-Year (N=40)	Univ (N=33)
OC Essay	1.25	1.00	1.13	1.46
IC Essay	2.77	2.50	2.95	2.61
Final Exam	3.35	3.75	3.38	3.12
Part & Att	3.82	4.13	3.63	4.06
Homework	4.65	4.63	4.55	4.79
Readings Test	4.70	4.88	4.68	4.67
Usage Test	4.78	5.00	4.80	4.70
Peer Eval	4.80	5.00	4.70	4.88
Lectures Test	4.93	5.00	4.90	4.94

Table VIII.1. Average Rankings of Types of Evaluation Used in First-semester/Quarter Freshman Writing Courses to Determine Final Grades.

As Table VIII.1 shows, the four sources of evaluation receiving the highest rankings in all four categories of responses are identical. Table VIII.1 also shows that the two highest ranked sources of evaluation are the "in class" essay and the "out of class essay." Of these two, clearly the more important is the "out of class essay." As in previous analyses, the small N for two-year colleges severely limits interpretation. It is, however, interesting to note the difference in relative ranks assigned to these two sources by directors in four-year institutions and in universities: while the average rank for four-year institutions for the "out of class essay" is higher than that for universities, the average rank for the "in class essay" is higher for universities. Essay writing is also the most important evaluation source in the two-year colleges. The third highest ranked source in all types of institutions is the final examination. In none of the 81 responding institutions does this examination take the form of an objective test. Of these 81 institutions, 72.4% indicated that the final examination took the form of a graded essay, with the remaining 27.6% indicating that it took the form of a graded essay combined with

an objective test. The percentage of two-year colleges in which the final examination took the form of a graded essay is 80%, the percentage of four-year institutions is 70%, and the percentage of universities is 73.9%.

Table VIII.1 indicates that there is a fair amount of agreement across institutions regarding the most important contributors to final grades in first-semester/quarter freshman writing courses. Unfortunately, we were unable to elicit information regarding specific evaluation procedures. These rankings only indicate that, for example, students' writing weighs heavily in the grades they receive; the rankings do not reveal anything about the methods or criteria employed in evaluating that writing.

VIII. 2. EVALUATION IN SECOND-SEMESTER/QUARTER FRESHMAN WRITING COURSES

Table VIII.2 summarizes the average rankings of sources of evaluation used to determine final grades in second-semester/quarter freshman writing courses in all institutions.

Type of Evaluation	Average Rankings ALL (N=50)	Two-Year (N=6)	Four-Year (N=24)	Univ (N=20)
OC Essay	1.40	1.00	1.08	1.80
IC Essay	2.92	3.17	3.08	2.65
Final Exam	3.20	3.17	3.42	2.90
Part & Att	3.70	3.67	3.54	3.85
Homework	4.60	4.33	4.63	4.65
Readings Test	4.42	4.50	4.25	4.60
Usage Test	4.82	4.33	4.88	4.90
Peer Eval	4.80	4.83	4.75	4.75
Lectures Test	4.74	4.33	4.70	4.60

Table VIII.2. Average Rankings of Types of Evaluation Used in Second-Semester/Quarter Freshman Writing Courses to Determine Final Grades.

The ordering of the sources of evaluation listed in Table VIII.2 is the same as that of Table VIII.1. This should facilitate comparsions between evaluation practices in first- and second-semester/quarter freshman writing courses. The order of

the rankings for the first four sources of evaluation is the same for second-semester/quarter courses as it is for first. However, the average ranking for the "out of class essay" and for the "in class essay" is generally lower across all institutions for second-semester/quarter courses than it is for first. In contrast, the average rankings across all institutions for the "final examination" and for "participation and attendance" is generally higher. In addition, some of the remaining five sources of evaluation contribute more to final grades in second-semester/quarter courses than they do in first, although these remaining five sources still received very low rankings by the program directors. However, the summary column for all institutions indicates that both "tests over readings" and "tests over lectures" contribute more to final grades in second-semester/quarter freshman writing courses than they do in first. These somewhat higher rankings probably reflect differences in the natures of the two courses, with the second-semester/quarter courses--as indicated in the survey of textbooks and the survey of classroom activities--probably more attentive to the interpretation of written texts, whether fiction or non-fiction.

CHAPTER IX

FACULTY EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Two important aspects of many writing programs are the procedures used to evaluate the teaching of composition faculty and the means available for helping composition faculty improve their teaching. We see these as related aspects of programs because, ideally, evaluations of faculty should provide one basis for faculty development programs. Both the evaluation of teaching and professional development of faculty are complex issues, and we were unable to explore either issue with the thoroughness we would have liked. Without direct observation of the settings of the responding writing program directors, it is impossible to develop much more than a very general picture of either faculty evaluation or faculty development practices.

IX. 1. FACULTY EVALUATION

Our efforts to explore the evaluation of composition teachers in writing programs around the country focused on two major questions: (1) the sources of data used as the bases for such evaluations and (2) the number of different kinds of data used in such evaluations.

IX. 1. 1. Sources of Evaluation Data for Four Classes of Faculty

To determine the sources of data used in evaluations of writing teachers, we asked the responding writing program directors to indicate those sources for four different classes of faculty. These sources of data for evaluations are the following: (1) fellow faculty members (FFM); (2) students (STUD); (3) director and/or supervisor of the writing program (D/S); and (4) departmental chairperson (DC). In addition, we asked the directors to specify whether "other" sources of evaluative data are used besides the four we listed, and we provided a category for "no evaluation required" (NONE). The information on sources of evaluation were elicited for four different faculty groups: (1) tenured full-time faculty (TFTF); (2) tenure-seeking full-time faculty (TSFTF); (3) nontenured, nontenure-seeking full-time faculty (NNSFTF); and (4) part-time faculty (PTF). We should point out a problem with the class of part-time faculty (PFT): we cannot tell from the responses to our question whether

the responding directors consistently included part-time faculty who are also graduate students in their departments.

Table IX.1 summarizes the responses of all writing program directors to our question about the sources of data for evaluations of composition faculty.

Percentage of Writing Program Directors Indicating Various Sources of Evaluation Data

Type of Faculty	Type of Institution	N	FFM	STUD	D/S	DC	OTHER	NONE
TFTF	Two-Year	13	30.8	84.6	30.8	53.8	15.4	0.0
	Four-Year	63	34.9	65.1	22.2	47.6	4.8	19.0
	University	44	27.3	52.3	22.7	2.3	2.3	29.5
	Combined	120	31.7	62.5	23.3	41.7	5.0	20.8
TSFTF	Two-Year	13	46.2	76.9	30.8	53.8	7.7	0.0
	Four-Year	63	57.1	69.8	30.2	58.7	6.3	7.9
	University	44	52.3	61.4	36.4	40.9	2.3	11.4
	Combined	120	54.2	67.5	32.5	51.7	5.0	8.3
NNSFTF	Two-Year	10	20.0	40.0	20.0	60.0	0.0	0.0
	Four-Year	62	32.3	51.6	24.2	43.5	3.2	4.8
	University	42	38.1	47.6	40.5	28.6	0.0	14.3
	Combined	114	33.3	49.1	29.8	39.5	1.8	7.9
PTF	Two-Year	13	23.1	84.6	38.5	61.5	7.7	0.0
	Four-Year	63	36.5	71.4	44.4	49.2	4.8	4.8
	University	42	33.3	54.8	52.4	26.2	7.1	9.5
	Combined	118	33.9	66.9	46.6	42.4	5.9	5.9

Sources of Evaluation Data: FFM (fellow faculty members); STUD (students); D/S (writing program director/supervisor); DC (departmental chairperson); OTHER (sources of evaluation data other than the previous four); NONE (no evaluation of composition faculty).

Faculty Groups Evaluated: TFTF (tenured full-time faculty); TSFTF (tenure-seeking full-time faculty); NNSFTF (nontenured nontenure-seeking full-time faculty); PTF (part-time faculty).

Table IX.1. Percentage of Responding Writing Program Directors Indicating Various Sources of Evaluation Data for Four Different Classes of Faculty.

Table IX.1 reveals that of the four classes of faculty, tenured full-time faculty (TFTF) are least likely to be evaluated at all. Table IX.1 also suggests that in the progression from two-year colleges to universities, the probability of any class of faculty being evaluated at all generally decreases. The amount of evaluation also generally decreases from two-year colleges to universities. For all classes of faculty, students appear to provide the bulk of evaluation data. Evaluation data drawn from students appear to be the most important with respect to three of the four classes of faculty, and for those three classes of faculty, such data appear less important as one moves from two-year colleges to four-year institutions to universities.

It should be noted that the rows of percentages, excluding those for "NONE," in Table IX.1 generally total about 200. By dividing this total by 100, we arrive at an estimate of the average number of sources of data used in evaluating various classes of faculty in different types of institutions. Thus about two sources of evaluation data are used in any given type of school for any given class of composition faculty. The table also indicates that in about one-third of the institutions, fellow faculty members (FFM) represent a source of data for evaluations of tenured full-time faculty (TFTF), nontenured nontenure-seeking full-time faculty (NNSFTF), and part-time faculty (PTF). For tenure-seeking full-time faculty (TSFTF), however, the percentage of institutions using fellow faculty members (FFM) as sources of evaluation data increases to about 50%. Table IX.1 also reveals that more schools of all types use writing program directors and/or supervisors as a source of data in evaluating tenure-seeking full-time faculty (TSFTF) and part-time faculty (PTF) than they do in evaluating the other two classes of faculty.

Department chairpersons serve as a source of data in evaluating all classes of faculty in a larger percentage of two-year colleges and four-year institutions than of universities. Two-year colleges rely on this source of data more than the other two types of schools. Perhaps remarkable is the fact that only 2.3% of the universities employ chairpersons as a source of data in evaluating tenured full-time faculty (TFTF), while a much larger percentage of the other types of institutions use this source of data in evaluating their tenured full-time faculty (TFTF).

IX. 1. 2. Sources of Data for Evaluating Graduate Teaching Assistants

Table IX.1 suggests that evaluation of composition faculty is a fairly important aspect of writing programs, regardless of the type of institution and regardless of the class of faculty. As we have pointed out, however, there is considerable variation across institutions and sources of evaluation data. We should also point out that we do not know whether the data summarized in

Table IX.1 reflect "required" or "optional" evaluation procedures.

Because we did not specify whether directors should include graduate teaching assistants within the class of part-time faculty, we do not know whether Table IX.1 includes data about the evaluation of graduate students teaching in writing programs. In another question, however, we did ask the directors to indicate the sources of data used to evaluate graduate students teaching in their programs. In addition to providing an "OTHER" category, we asked the directors to indicate if the following sources of data are used in evaluating the teaching of graduate students: (1) course syllabi and/or policy statements (SYLL); (2) grading practices (GRADE); and (3) students (STUD). A fourth source of data--classroom observation by faculty (OBSER)--was written in by 37 of the 56 directors who responded to the question. The findings are summarized in Table IX.2.

Type of Institution	N	Percentage of Institutions Using Various Sources of Data in Evaluating Graduate Student Teachers				
		SYLL	GRADE	STUD	OBSER	OTHER
Four-Year	18	67	83	94	61	25
Priv	5	80	60	80	60	40
Publ	13	62	92	100	62	15
Universities	38	68	74	87	68	29
Priv	9	67	56	56	56	33
Publ	29	69	79	97	72	28
Combined	56	68	77	89	66	23

Table IX.2. Percentage of Institutions Using Various Sources of Data in Evaluating Graduate Students who Teach Writing Courses.

Table IX.2 indicates that the most important source of evaluation data for graduate students who teach in writing programs is the students who enroll in their classes. The graduate students' grading practices constitute the next most important source of evaluation data. Course syllabi and classroom observation are less important sources, but are still used in over 65% of all responding institutions. Table IX.2 reveals that graduate student teachers are least evaluated in private universities, although even in private universities at least two and one-half sources of data are used on the average in

evaluations of graduate student teachers. Nearly equal amounts of evaluation appear to occur in the other three types of institutions.

Table IX.2 suggests (1) that the teaching of graduate students is perhaps more thoroughly and carefully evaluated than the teaching of other faculty and (2) that such evaluations are usually based on data drawn from at least three sources. Again, we are unable to determine whether evaluation of graduate students is "required" or "optional."

In concluding this section on the sources of evaluation data, we should point out that the results summarized in Table IX.1 and Table IX.2 indicate nothing about the specific ways evaluations are carried out or how the data from various sources are weighted in judgments of teaching performance. These are important issues that should be investigated very carefully at another time.

IX. 2. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

On the assumption that the evaluation of composition faculty is, in many cases, related to professional development programs, we asked the writing program directors a number of questions about faculty development programs for composition teachers in their institutions. We asked about (1) the use and frequency of in-service workshops for various classes of composition faculty, (2) the use of outside "consultants" in such workshops, (3) the availability of travel funds to support the development of composition faculty, and (4) the training of graduate students who teach composition in the institutions where they are working on advanced degrees.

IX. 2. 1. In-Service Professional Development Workshops

Table IX.3 summarizes the results of our survey of the use of in-service workshops for the training of composition faculty.

Type of Institution	N	Percentage of Institutions Offering Workshops for Faculty Groups			
		TFTF	TSFTF	NNSFTF	PTF
Two-Year	12	91.6	75.0	33.3	58.3
Four-Year	63	63.5	61.9	49.2	65.1
Priv	32	71.9	65.6	43.8	65.6
Publ	31	54.8	58.1	54.8	64.5
Universities	43	60.5	62.8	65.1	72.1
Priv	12	41.7	41.7	50.0	66.7
Publ	31	67.7	71.0	71.0	74.2
Combined	118	65.3	63.6	53.4	70.0

Table IX.3. Percentage of Institutions Offering In-Service Workshops for Improving the Composition Teaching of Tenured Full-Time Faculty (TFTF), Tenure-Seeking Full-Time Faculty (TSFTF), Nontenured Nontenure-Seeking Full-Time Faculty (NNSFTF), and Part-Time Faculty (PTF).

When the rows for the various types of institutions are summed and the sums divided by 100, Table IX.3 indicates that for all four faculty groups, public universities on the average provide more opportunities for faculty development through in-service workshops than do the other types of institutions. The columns in Table IX.3 indicate a great deal of variation in the percentages of institutions offering in-service workshops for different groups of faculty. A larger percentage of two-year colleges provide workshops for tenured full-time faculty (TFTF) than of any other institutional type. In contrast, a smaller percentage of two-year colleges offer workshops for nontenured nontenure-seeking full-time faculty (NNSFTF) than of any other type of school. A somewhat larger percentage of two-year colleges offer workshops for tenure-seeking full-time faculty (TSFTF) than of the other types of schools, although 71% of the public universities offer in-service workshops for that faculty group. More public universities offer workshops for nontenured nontenure-seeking full-time faculty (NNSFTF) than the other types of schools. This is not an unexpected finding since public universities probably employ a larger number of such faculty than do most of the other types of institutions. If the percentages listed under "PTF" for two-year colleges are excluded, we see that about the same percentage of other types of institutions offer in-service workshops for part-time faculty (PTF), even though a somewhat larger percentage obtains for public universities. Because the sums across the various rows all

exceed 200 (with a range from 200.1 for private universities to 283.9 for public universities), it would seem that all five types of institutions offer professional development workshops for at least two of the four faculty groups identified in Table IX.3. The sum for all institutions combined, in fact, indicates that workshops are provided on the average for 2.5 of the four faculty groups.

IX. 2. 2. Frequency of In-Service Workshops

Analyses of data collected for a subsequent question reveal that in-service workshops for composition teachers are conducted more than once each semester or quarter in 38% of the 100 institutions responding. Another 25% offer such workshops on a once-a-semester/quarter basis, and 24% offer them once every year. The remaining 13% offer in-service workshops for composition teachers no more than once every two academic years.

Public universities offer such workshops more frequently than do the other types of institutions. Of the 31 responding public universities, 81% offer such workshops at least once a semester. Private four-year institutions and private universities lie at the other extreme, with about 50% of either type offering faculty development workshops at least once each semester. Approximately 60% of all 100 responding institutions offer such in-service faculty development workshops at least once each semester.

IX. 2. 3. Use of "Consultants" in In-Service Workshops

We also asked the responding directors to indicate whether they brought in outside "consultants" to assist with in-service faculty development workshops. We believed that this question would provide some estimate of the amount of cross-fertilization of ideas about the teaching of writing. Of the 96 institutions responding to the question, about 47% employ "consultants" in that capacity. Among the various types of institutions, a greater percentage (about 60%) of two-year colleges and of private four-year institutions employ outside "consultants" for in-service workshops than of the other types of schools. Fewer (34.8%) public four-year institutions appear to use "consultants" for in-service workshops than any other type of institution. About 47% of all four-year institutions and about 43% of all universities use outside "consultants" for in-service training programs.

IX. 2. 4. Training of Graduate-Student Teachers of Writing

In a question related to faculty development, we asked the responding directors from four-year institutions and from universities to indicate whether their institutions require graduate-student teachers to complete at least one graduate course in the teaching of writing prior to or during their first semester or quarter of teaching. Of the 55 responding institutions that employ graduate students as writing teachers, 35 (63.6%) indicated that those teachers are required to complete at least one graduate course in the teaching of writing prior to or during their first teaching assignment. Of the 17 four-year institutions who employ their own graduate students, eight (47.1%) require the completion of such a course. Of the five private four-year institutions who employ their own graduate students to teach in their writing programs, only one (20%) require a graduate course in the teaching of writing, while seven (58.3%) of the public four-year institutions have such a requirement. Twenty-seven (71.1%) of the 38 universities who employ their own graduate students as writing teachers require completion of at least one such course prior to or during the first semester or quarter of teaching. Of the private universities, 66.7% (6 of 9) have such a requirement, as do 72.4% (21 of 29) of the public universities. While these percentages and figures indicate that instruction in the teaching of writing is mandatory for graduate-student teachers in the majority of institutions surveyed, these same percentages and figures indicate that 36.4% of the responding institutions apparently see no need for instruction in the teaching of writing.

IX. 2. 5. Travel Funds for Faculty Development

Another indication of commitment to faculty development is the availability of funds for traveling to professional meetings where composition and the teaching of composition are discussed. Accordingly, we asked the responding writing program directors to indicate whether travel funds for professional development are available for teachers of writing. The responses to this question are summarized in Table IX.2.

Type of Institution	N	Percentage of Institutions Providing Travel Funds for Professional Development of Composition Teachers			
		TFTF	TSFTF	NNSFTF	PTF
Two-Year	12	100.0	91.7	33.3	0.0
Four-Year	62	88.7	87.1	43.5	25.8
Priv	31	96.7	93.5	41.9	22.6
Publ	31	80.6	80.6	45.2	29.0
Universities	42	92.9	90.1	45.3	35.7
Priv	12	91.7	100.0	25.0	33.3
Publ	30	93.3	86.7	53.3	36.7
Combined	114	93.0	90.3	43.9	27.2

Table IX.4. Percentage of Institutions Providing Travel Funds for Professional Development of Composition Teachers Among Tenured Full-Time Faculty (TFTF), Tenure-Seeking Full-Time Faculty (TSFTF), Nontenured Nontenure-Seeking Full-Time Faculty (NNSFTF), and Part-Time Faculty (PTF).

Table IX.4 shows that travel funds for the professional development of composition teachers are much more readily available for tenured full-time faculty (TFTF) and for tenure-seeking full-time faculty (TSFTF) than for the two groups of more transient faculty, even though the latter two groups teach much more composition in some institutions than either of the former two groups of faculty. The smallest percentage (80.6%) of institutions funding travel for faculty development of composition teachers among the ranks of tenured (TFTF) and tenure-seeking full-time faculty (TSFTF) is found among public four-year institutions. With the exception of public four-year institutions, travel funds for the professional development of composition teachers who are either tenured or tenure-seeking are available in about 90% of all institutions. A larger percentage of public universities make travel funds for composition teachers who are nontenured and nontenure-seeking (NNSFTF) or part-time (PTF) than other types of institutions. The percentages for these two classes in public universities are 53.3 and 36.7, respectively.

By summing across the rows in Table IX.4, we can arrive at an estimate of the average number of faculty groups receiving travel funds for the development of composition teaching in the various types of institutions. Because only percentages are listed under the four classes of faculty, a row-sum of 400 would

indicate that all groups are funded in all institutions of that type. All of the row-sums for Table IX.4 exceed 200, thus indicating that on the average at least two faculty groups receive travel funds from any given type of institution. Those two groups are, of course, most likely to be tenure (TFTF) and tenure-seeking (TSFTF). The row-sum for all institutions combined is 254.4. This figure suggests that on the average the 114 institutions responding to the question about travel funds offer faculty development travel for composition teachers in at least two of the four classes of faculty.

IX. 3. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHING EVALUATION AND FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Using the data collected on faculty evaluation and development, we performed analyses which enable us to summarize the relationship between the number of types of evaluations and the opportunities provided for faculty development. The classes of faculty used were the same as those in the previous two sections of the present chapter. If, for example, tenure-seeking faculty were evaluated by student evaluations and by peer review, the number of evaluations would be two. The opportunities for faculty development were categorized as follows: if the institution provided either faculty workshops or funded travel for professional development for a particular class of faculty, that institution was placed in Class 1; if the institution provided both faculty workshops and travel funds for a particular class of faculty, it was placed in Class 2.

Table IX.5 below summarizes the ranks within different types of institutions for different faculty groups with respect to the number of types of evaluation and opportunities for faculty development, with one column devoted to the number of types of evaluation and one to opportunities for faculty development. The classes of faculty are rank-ordered in each column by largest number of types of evaluation or by most opportunities for faculty development.

NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS	OPPORTUNITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT
All Institutions (N=116)	
TSFTF	TFTF
PTF	TSFTF
NNSFTF	NNSFTF
TFTF	PTF
Two-Year Colleges (N=12)	
*TFTF	TFTF
*TSFTF	TSFTF
*NNSFTF	NNSFTF
PTF	PTF
Four-Year Institutions (N=62)	
*TSFTF	*TSFTF
*PTF	*TFTF
NNSFTF	NNSFTF
TFTF	PTF
Universities (N=42)	
TSFTF	*TFTF
*PTF	*TSFTF
*NNSFTF	NNSFTF
TFTF	PTF

Table IX.5. Rank Orders of Faculty Groups Within Types of Institutions Showing the Relationship Between Number of Evaluations and Opportunities for Faculty Development. (Note: Asterisks within institutional types indicate ties in ranks.)

As Table IX.5 illustrates, within the category of "all institutions" "tenure-seeking full-time faculty" (TSFTF) are those teachers of writing courses whose teaching is most frequently evaluated, and "tenured full-time faculty" (TFTF) are those whose teaching is least often evaluated. "Part-time faculty" (PTF) are evaluated somewhat less often than "tenure-seeking full-time faculty" (TSFTF), but considerably more often than either "nontenured, nontenure-seeking full-time faculty" (NNSFTF) or "tenured full-time faculty" (TFTF). Although "tenured full-time faculty" (TFTF) within the category of "all institutions" are evaluated least often, they have the greatest number of opportunities for professional development. "Tenure-seeking full-time faculty" (TSFTF), the class most often evaluated, rank second with respect to opportunities for professional development. "Part-time faculty" (PTF), the group ranked second with respect to frequency of evaluation, have the fewest opportunities for professional development. For this

class of faculty, most institutions neither offer faculty development workshops nor provide funding for travel to professional meetings.

With the exception of two-year colleges, where "tenured full-time faculty" (TFTF) are evaluated most frequently, "tenure-seeking full-time faculty" (TSFTF) are those faculty members most frequently evaluated in the various types of institutions. Except for those in two-year colleges, they also have the most opportunities for faculty development, with the rankings for them in four-year institutions and universities identical to those for "tenured full-time faculty" (TFTF).

In four-year institutions and in universities, "part-time faculty" (PTF) have the fewest opportunities for faculty development, but the frequency with which they are evaluated ranks second only to that of "tenure-seeking full-time faculty" (TSFTF).

The rankings reported in Table IX.5 seem to indicate that institutions are generally concerned that the composition teaching of "tenure-seeking full-time faculty" (TSFTF) be evaluated frequently. Such evaluations probably constitute an important part of decisions regarding tenure. The institutions also seem concerned that that class of faculty be given opportunities to improve the teaching in writing courses. The rankings reported in Table IX.5 also seem to suggest that while institutions may be generally interested in the quality of teaching of "part-time faculty" (PTF), they are generally not inclined to provide opportunities for professional development for that group of faculty. Our findings with regard to the evaluation and development of "part-time faculty" (PTF) are, we think, noteworthy because, as we have shown in a previous chapter, approximately 40% of all sections of college writing courses nationwide are taught by "part-time faculty" (PTF), either those who are used to fill in on demand or those who are graduate teaching assistants within the schools where they teach.

CHAPTER X

SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL ASPECTS OF COLLEGE WRITING PROGRAMS

Most of the items on our questionnaire elicited numerical data about various aspects of the writing programs included in our sample. Most such questions were relatively staightforward, seeking to determine, for example, how many composition classes different groups of faculty teach during a given semester or how often the teaching of particular groups of faculty is evaluated. Other questions eliciting numerical data, questions such as those about the types of writing done in freshman writing courses, required that the responding directors answer according to certain categories that we provided within the questions themselves. Such procedures we believe were necessary in order to collect data which were comparable in nature.

In the present chapter we report on the prose statements that the responding writing program directors made to two questions, one on the most successful aspects of the programs represented in our sample and one on the least successful aspects of those programs. The decision to elicit prose statements uncolored by categories we might have supplied was made in order to eliminate the kind of bias that is often, although unintentionally, built into questions which ask whether such-and-such a thing is present or not in a particular program. Had we provided a list of possible "most successful" aspects for program directors to check off, we might have increased unnaturally the number and kinds of "most successful" aspects which the directors saw in their programs. For example, had we asked directors to check off items on a list containing "doing sentence-combining exercises" or "developing skills in using the library," a large number of directors may have marked those aspects as "most successful" ones. In the prose responses to our question about successful aspects, these two were mentioned only infrequently. Although our insistence on uncued prose responses to our questions about the most and least successful aspects of writing programs may have caused some directors not to list certain aspects they otherwise might have, we assumed the alternative was less desirable.

The prose responses to both questions--what was most and least successful--were analyzed carefully for content. These content analyses were performed in several stages (see note 20). The results of our analyses of these prose responses are reported in the following two sections. In summarizing these results, we make substantial use of quotations from the responding directors

regarding the most and least successful aspects of their programs.

X. 1. SUCCESSFUL ASPECTS OF WRITING PROGRAMS

Our survey of the most successful aspects of college writing programs elicited responses from 104 schools. Of these schools, 11 were two-year colleges, 52 four-year schools, and 41 were universities. The responses are summarized in Table X.1 where they are presented hierarchically according to the frequency of their occurrence.

Most Successful Aspects	All (N=104)	2-Year (N=11)	4-Year (N=52)	Univ (N=41)
Wr Lab/Wrkshp	37.5	36.4	38.5	36.6
Clear Eff Prose for Aud	32.7	18.2	32.7	36.6
Teacher Train Prog	32.7	18.2	28.9	41.5
Peer-Tut/Collab Learn	29.8	36.4	36.5	19.5
Placement Procedures	26.0	45.5	25.0	22.0
Writing as Process	22.1	9.1	25.0	22.0
Tenured Fac Teach Wrtng	20.2	18.2	21.2	19.5
Revision Skills	18.3	18.2	23.1	12.2
Common Syllabus	17.3	9.1	9.6	29.3
Student Wrtng as Text	17.3	18.2	21.2	12.4
Read Crit/Analytically	14.4	8.1	9.6	22.0
Grading Practices	13.5	9.1	13.5	14.6
Inv Fac in Other Discipl	13.5	9.1	23.1	2.4
Attitudes Toward Wrtng	12.5	9.1	17.3	7.3
Wrtng Across Curr	12.5	0.0	17.3	9.6
Fac see Comp as Schlor	9.6	0.0	7.7	14.6
Coop of Higher Admin	8.7	9.1	3.8	14.6
Flexibility in Program	6.7	0.0	9.6	4.9
Upper Div Wrtng Courses	5.8	0.0	7.7	4.9
Use Library Resources	4.8	0.0	5.8	4.9

Table X.1. Percentage of Responding Directors Indicating the Most Successful Aspects of Their Writing Programs.

Column one of Table X.1 indicates the percentage of all 104 responding directors who named the particular "most successful aspect." These percentages determined the ordering of the items listed in Table X.1, with the aspects named most frequently appearing first.

Column one in Table X.1 indicates that when the responses for all 104 institutions are pooled, "writing laboratories/workshops" which operate independently of scheduled classroom instruction in composition is the most frequently cited "successful aspect." Of the 104 responding directors, 37.5% see their writing laboratories as one of the most successful aspects of their programs. Typical of the responses of all directors who cited the "writing laboratory" as one of the most successful aspects of their programs is the following brief statement from a director of a public four-year institution: "Availability of a writing lab with individualized tutoring has been an essential complement to all our writing courses." Among the 52 responding directors from four-year institutions, this aspect was named most often, with 38.5% of these directors naming their writing laboratory as one of the most successful aspects of their programs. For the other two groups of directors, this aspect was among two or more other aspects which were named second most often. Of the 11 directors from two-year colleges and the 41 directors from universities, 36.4% and 36.6%, respectively, named their writing laboratories as one of the most successful aspects of their programs. Among the three classes of institutions, writing laboratories were among at least the four most frequently cited successful aspects.

When the responses from all 104 directors are pooled across institutional types, two aspects of writing programs--"teaching students to write clear, effective prose for different audiences" and "conducting teacher training programs"--were cited with the next greatest frequency.

The frequencies with which "teaching students to write clear, effective prose for different audiences" was cited varied considerably across types of institutions. As Table X.1 shows, only two (18.2%) of the directors from two-year colleges cited this item as a successful aspect of their program, while over 32% of the directors from four-year institutions and from universities did. If the number of two-year colleges in our sample were larger, we could say with some confidence that this large difference between the frequency with which the item was mentioned by two-year directors on the one hand and the directors from the two remaining classes on the other is perhaps a reflection of differences in the ways writing courses are perceived in the various institutions and perhaps a reflection of the different student populations served.

The ways in which the responding directors articulated their successes in teaching students to write clearly and effectively for different audiences varied. But most expressed their successes with reference to the goals of their programs or courses. A director from a small four-year institution wrote:

> Our goals are to help students become self-sufficent as writers . . . by the time they graduate. Being self-sufficient means that they are able, without help,

> to understand and focus clearly conceived ideas into an organized, fully developed essay intended for an identifiable audience and reflecting a controlled voice or tone.

Another director, again from a small four-year institution expressed the same thought differently, relating the ability to write well to the ability to interpret one's experience:

> . . . A good writer is first a good interpreter of experience, capable of imposing an appropriate interpretive structure on experience, communicating this experience to an audience (real or simulated), and in doing so finding an appropriate organization that stems from the writer's interpretive structuring.

Such statements reveal the complexity of the thought underlying many of the statements we coded under the more general rubric of "teaching students to write clear, effective prose for different audiences." Few of the comments we read suggested to us that the responding directors saw their successes in teaching students to write effectively for audiences as a mean accomplishment. The comments of most, though not all, suggested a profound understanding not only of what constitutes effective prose but also the difficulties encountered in teaching students how to do such writing. Although some readers might have expected every director to cite "teaching students to write clear, effective prose for different audiences" as a successful aspect of their programs, it may be that many who are cognizant of the difficulties of doing so are simply realistic enough to recognize failures may outnumber successes in this area.

Among all 104 responding institutions, "teacher training programs" were cited with the same frequency as "teaching students to write clear, effective prose for different audiences." As Table X.1 shows, this aspect of college writing programs was cited least often by directors from two-year colleges. Of the 11 directors from two-year colleges, only two (18.2%) said that their "teacher training program" was among the most successful aspects of their programs. In contrast, 28.9% of the 52 directors from four-year institutions and 41.5% of the 41 directors from universities cited their "teacher training program" as one of the most successful aspects of their programs. Among the directors from universities, this particular programmatic aspect was the one cited most frequently, and among the directors from four-year institutions it was the fourth most frequently cited aspect.

These differences between the percentages of directors citing "teacher training programs" as one of the most successful aspects are probaly a function of the degree to which the various types of institutions have to rely on part-time faculty,

especially graduate students, to teach their writing courses. One director from a large and well-known midwestern university put the matter this way:

> I suspect the most successful part [of our program] is the new training program for TAs that we've established over the last five years (and are trying to improve). Now TAs can go into classes with an overview of the writing process, a sense of what a syllabus is for, a fair idea of what they can expect and what they can live with, and some notions of what certain writing assignments will yield.

In many of the responses of directors from universities, we found similar expressions of this successful aspect. In many cases, it seemed to us that university writing program directors, as well as several of the directors from four-year institutions, developed such training programs to deal specifically with the teaching of graduate students in their programs.

We did not, however, find that successful "training programs" are limited to graduate teaching assistants. While such "training programs" are frequently so limited in universities, they are not in other types of institutions. In the other two types of institutions, directors cited "training programs" both for faculty within English departments and for faculty in other disciplines. For example, one director from a public four-year institution indicated that one of the most successful aspects of his program was the "training program" he had developed for faculty throughout his department. He wrote that this "training program" has been very successful "in sensitizing our faculty to the theoretical and pedagogical implications of the last ten years of work in writing," thereby greatly enhancing the teaching of writing throughout his department. Another director--this one from a small, private four-year institution--cited a different kind of "training program" as one of the most successful aspects of the writing program at her school. This "training program" is one designed for faculty in all disciplines. She describes the program and its success in the following way:

> A faculty Writing Workshop, conducted by "outside experts," was highly successful and involved comparatively painless soul-searching as to how much, what kind, and when writing assignments should be made . . . [in non-English, non-writing] classes.

We find it significant that "training programs" of the latter two types were most often cited among the most successful aspects of programs in small institutions. Rarely were they cited by directors from large universities.

The fourth item listed in Table X.1--"making use of peer tutoring or other methods of collaborative learning"--was cited as a successful aspect of writing programs by 29.8% of the 104 responding directors. This particular aspect of writing programs was cited most frequently by directors in two-year colleges and four-year institutions. The percentages for both groups are approximately 36.5. According to one director from a small, private four-year institution that makes considerable use of "collaborative learning": "Peer feedback gives the students immediate and face-to-face evaluation of how well their writing is succeeding." Generally institutions use peer tutoring most often as a means of evaluating student writing, and typically the tutors are members of the class. The use of "collaboratively learning" is not, however, limited to that one method. In the case of one small, private four-year institution, the use of peers as evaluators was so successful that the director developed a program for training peer tutors to function in classes in which they were not themselves enrolled. Other methods of "collaborative learning" were also cited, perhaps none more frequently than the use of group writing assignments. As one director from a public four-year institution put it, such assignments allow "students to learn more about writing because they must constantly accommodate the needs of the group with which they are writing." Another director in whose program such collaborative writing assignments are used attributes their success to "the fact that our students tend to learn better and more quickly from one another than they do from teachers."

We think it noteworthy that "peer tutoring and other methods of collaborative learning" was cited much more frequently by directors in two-year colleges and four-year institutions than by directors from universities. Approximately 36.5% of the directors from the former types of institutions cited that aspect as one of the more successful in their programs, but only 19.5% of the directors from universities did. The smaller percentage of universities directors could indicate either that "peer tutoring and collaborative learning" is less used in university writing programs than in the other two types of institutions or that it is used less successfully in university writing programs. However, based on the statements we read, our impression is that the use and the success of "collaborative learning" methods are directly related to (1) the size of the writing program and (2) the number of transient faculty--temporary full-time teachers, part-time teachers, and graduate teaching assistants--employed in the writing programs.

"Placement procedures" constitute another frequently cited successful aspect of college writing programs. This aspect was named by about 26% of the 104 responding directors, with about one-fourth of the directors from four-year institutions and universities and about half of the directors from two-year colleges citing it as one of the most successful aspects of their programs. According to most of these directors, their "placement procedures" allow them to match the abilities of their students with levels of instruction, thus increasing the students' chances

of success in writing courses. One director from a small, private four-year institution wrote,

> Grouping students by ability . . . and allowing the lowest track grade flexibility . . . allows us to complete remediation activities before students must begin their "regular" writing class.

Many of these directors stressed the importance of good "placement procedures." Often this importance was tied to the ever-changing nature of the student population served. A director from a two-year college wrote that

> In the past five years, our writing program has had to adjust and evolve on a crisis basis as a new type of student has entered the community college--the adult student and the poorly prepared student. We have been flexible and have initiated several new policies to meet the needs of these students. Our placement techniques have been particularly successful.

Virtually all of the directors who cited their "placement procedures" as one of the most successful aspects of their programs saw those "procedures" as one means of seeing that students receive writing instruction designed to meet their needs.

Over 22% of the 104 directors cited as one of the most successful aspects of their programs the ability of their teachers to teach "writing as process," an aspect which is related to others listed in Table X.1. The percentage of directors from two-year colleges citing this aspect is smaller than that for either of the other two types of institutions. Another 18.3% of the 104 directors singled out the teaching of "revision skills" specifically as one of the most successful aspects of their programs. Most of the statements about success in teaching the "writing process" in general read much like the following one from the director at a private four-year institution: "Our emphasis on pre-writing, writing, editing, and rewriting has produced some very fine freshman essays." Those directors who noted process usually stressed the connection between the process approach to the teaching of writing and the quality of the student writing produced. Only rarely was teaching the "writing process" cited as an end in itself.

Other directors tended to view teaching "revision skills" as the most important "process" skill they successfully teach. However, most also tended to view "revision skills" very broadly, as does this director from a large public university:

> They [students] begin to understand the recursive nature of writing and begin to see . . . revision as occurring from the moment the idea is got; through its shaping and reshaping in thinking, researching and writing; to the time of the final reshaping (or beginning all over again--almost) that comes with conferring with an editor-teacher.

This response is typical, though perhaps more eloquent than most, of those which cited the teaching of "revision skills" as a successful aspect separate from but related to the teaching of "writing as process."

Another successful aspect we see as related to the teaching of "writing as process" is the use of "student writing as the text for the writing course," an aspect which is implicit in the previous quotation. Most of the directors who cited this aspect of their programs emphasized variants of the workshop approach to the teaching of writing, an approach which involves the teacher directly with the student during the act of composing. With this approach the role of the teacher as coach is emphasized as much if not more than the role of the teacher as an evaluator or judge after the process is completed. It is probably noteworthy that with but one exception those directors who saw "changing student attitudes toward writing" as a successful aspect of their programs also saw teaching "writing as process" as a successful aspect.

As Table X.1 indicates, the directors named other successful aspects of their programs as well, but those we have singled out thus far seem to be the most important ones. However, a number of the remaining aspects listed seem to indicate a fair amount of success in getting faculty involved in or committed to the teaching of writing. Over 20% of the 104 directors, for example, mentioned their success in getting "tenured faculty to teach writing courses," a success which occurred with about the same frequency in all types of institutions. This success is probably directly related to the successes nearly 10% of the directors had in getting their faculty to see "composition as a scholarly enterprise," as a director from a private four-year institution put it. Such cooperation is frequently reflected in the implementation of successful department-wide grading practices. One such instance at a large public university is described below:

> Since it has been very difficult to get our faculty to agree upon a common methodology for teaching writing or a common philosophy of writing, we have adopted a compromise: faculty will teach by whatever method they prefer, but their students will have to perform satisfactorily on a department-wide final examination in order to pass out of their writing class. The criteria for the exam specify those aspects of writing that we

consider important (generation of ideas, focusing and developing those ideas in ways that are effective with and persuasive to the audience, cohesion and syntactic fluency, correctness).

Agreement on grading criteria may affect both what is taught within individual classes and how those classes are taught. But the grading procedures certainly appear to have increased the involvement and commitment of faculty.

While these successful aspects focus primarily on changes within English departments, others focus on faculty in other disciplines as well. Indeed, nearly 14% of the 104 directors cited their "involving faculty in other disciplines in the teaching of writing" as one of the most successful aspects of their programs. Often such successes simply take the form of getting faculty in other disciplines to assign writing or to stress not only the content of a student's text--whether a laboratory report, an examination, or a research paper--but also its form. Involvement of faculty from other disciplines is, however, sometimes more formalized. For example, 12.5% of the 104 directors indicated that "writing across the curriculum" approaches were among the most successful aspects of their programs. In most such cases, the directors emphasized the benefits that students derive from those approaches. A director from a small private four-year institution wrote that "The 'writing across the curriculum' approach . . . lets . . . [students] see connections between critical reading/thinking/writing which pays off for the rest of their colleges careers."

These successful aspects of college writing programs seem to reflect what might be called curricular, instructional, and administrative aspects of college writing programs. That relatively few directors cited any one successful aspect of college writing programs suggests that those programs vary considerably from one institutional context to another, from one department to another, from one director to another. It is, however, interesting that six of the ten most frequently cited successful aspects--"writing laboratory/workshop," "peer tutoring/collaborative learning," "writing as process," "revision skills," "student writing as text," and "clear effective prose for an audience"--are probably related to instructional and curricular concerns for teaching the processes of writing. The remaining four of the ten most frequently cited successful aspects--"teacher training program," "placement procedures," "getting tenured faculty to teach writing classes," and "using a common syllabus"--may be more directly related to administrative concerns.

In these statements, we also found considerable evidence of a variety of approaches to writing program administration, with some directors investing considerable energy in one area while others focus on another area. The variety of successful aspects

cited--and we have listed only those which were cited by at least three directors--suggests that different directors approach their jobs in different ways, striving for and achieving successes only where they are possible. If the contexts of writing programs differ from one institution to another, it is difficult to say--on the basis of the statements we read--in what aspects of writing programs directors around the country ought to invest their energies.

X. 2. UNSUCCESSFUL ASPECTS OF WRITING PROGRAMS

Not only did the responding directors comment about the successful aspects of their programs, but they did also about the unsuccessful or least successful aspects as well. In the statements about the least successful aspects of the directors' programs, we found nearly as much diversity as we found in the statements about the successful aspects. We need to point out that slightly more than 10% of the 94 directors who wrote answers to the question about unsuccessful aspects indicated that their programs have no unsuccessful aspects, no weaknesses. The most frequently cited least successful aspects are summarized in Table X.2.

Least Successful Aspects	All (N=94)	2-Year (N=9)	4-Year (N=50)	Univ (N=35)
Commit of Tenured Fac	31.9	22.2	32.0	34.3
Ineff Wrtng Prog Admin	25.6	11.1	34.0	17.1
Support of Engl Fac	25.5	22.2	24.0	28.6
Program Coherence	20.2	11.1	30.0	9.7
Too Few L-D Courses	14.9	22.2	10.0	20.0
Part-Time Fac	14.9	0.0	14.0	20.0
Remedial Courses	11.7	33.3	12.0	5.7
Teach Training Prog	8.5	0.0	12.0	5.7
Too few WAC Courses	7.5	11.1	6.0	8.6
Uniform Grading Prac	7.5	0.0	10.0	5.7
Teaching of Lit	7.5	0.0	4.0	14.3
Students to Wrtng Lab	6.4	11.1	6.0	5.7
ESL Program	5.3	0.0	6.0	5.7
Creat & Originality	4.3	0.0	6.0	2.9
Student Confidence	3.2	11.1	4.0	0.0

Table X.2. Percentage of Responding Writing Program Directors Indicating Least Successful Aspects of Their Programs.

As Table X.2 shows, "commitment of tenured faculty to the teaching of writing" appears most frequently as the least successful aspect of the programs surveyed. A director from a public university put the issue most succinctly:

> They [the tenured faculty] really don't give a damn about teaching freshman to write. They think they have better things to do.

While most of the directors did not state the issue quite so forcefully, almost 32% of the 94 responding directors indicated that their failure to get tenured faculty to commit themselves to the teaching of writing was a serious weakness in their programs. This weakness was cited least often by directors from two-year colleges and most often by directors from universities.

The second most frequently mentioned weakness was an "ineffective writing program administration." Fully one-fourth of the responding 94 directors cited this aspect. Among the three types of institutions, it was cited most often by directors from four-year institutions, with 34% of 50 directors mentioning it specifically. The chairperson from one of these institutions, a private one, wrote about this weakness:

> The least successful aspect of our program is that we have a program of sorts, but we have no director. Since no one is responsible for coordinating the program, we do not achieve as much consistency and coherence in our program as we should. We have tried working on this by informal discussion and having some department meetings centered on the writing program. Such discussions are helpful but do not provide the kind of cohesiveness needed.

The aspect which was cited third most often was getting the "support of English department faculty for the writing program." This aspect is, of course, related to the "commitment of tenured faculty to the teaching of writing," but it differs because "support" for a program differs from "commitment" to the teaching of writing. One can be committed to teaching writing without being supportive of the particular goals of the program. At any rate, this item was cited by over 25% of the 94 directors. Typically, those directors who cited this aspect indicated some difficulty in changing the way established faculty teach writing and in changing the goals those faculty espouse. Representative of those responses is the following one from a director at a private four-year institution:

> Some of our English faculty resist attempts to

> incorporate current rhetorical theory into workshops, course design, etc. For example, I try to emphasize the process approach rather than the product approach to writing. At least one faculty member uses only the product approach.

Cited by about 20% of the responding directors as a weakness in their programs or as an unsuccessful aspect of them was a "lack of program coherence." This aspect was cited much more frequently by directors in four-year institutions than by directors in either two-year colleges or universities. Often these directors mentioned the absence of common and articulated goals as the cause of the lack of coherence their programs. "The problem is," wrote one director from a private four-year institution, "that we don't have goals as a group. Each faculty member has his/her own ideas, and some or most of those ideas are antithetical. We hardly have a 'writing program.'" Another director, this one from a public four-year institution, noted that the department has not been able to articulate "goals or standards" for its writing program, the result being that no one knows "what is or is not happening in the program." Other directors pointed to a lack of coherence which resulted not from inadequate or unexpressed goals, but rather from a failure to establish a "convincing sequence from one course to another."

About 15% of the 94 directors indicated that one weakness of their programs was an inadequate number of lower-division courses. Sometimes, as in the case of one public university, the insufficient number of lower-division courses was the result of institutional policies beyond the control of the writing program itself:

> . . . There is no university-wide requirement for freshman English. Each department establishes whether its majors take one or two semesters. The department does not attempt to teach everything in a single course; consequently, students who do not complete the sequence move on to academic work and the marketplace without all the writing skills the department thinks ideal.

From a public four-year institution came a similar response:

> One other problem that is appropriate for mention here is the paucity of writing courses available to our students. I favor a course in addition to our basic course, one in which students can stretch out and expand their rhetorical skills, their style.

Most directors stated their concern over the inadequate number of lower-division courses very concisely, without referring to the

larger institutional context: "One semester of writing instruction," writes a director from a two-year college, "simply is not enough."

Having to staff writing courses with "part-time faculty" was cited by about 15% of the 94 responding directors. Not surprisingly, this unsuccessful aspect was cited most often by directors from universities, where a generally higher percentage of part-time writing teachers are employed. The problems associated with dependence on part-time faculty were elaborated best by the director of the writing program at a university:

> Until quite recently, most of our Freshman English sections were staffed by full-time members of the department. Now, with budget cuts, some retirements and some full-timers having released time for duties outside the department, we are using a high proportion of part-timers. In four or five years, this proportion has gone from having roughly 20% of the freshman sections taught by part-timers to the present very bad situation of having about 85% taught by them. When most sections were taught by full-timers, all relatively familiar with each others' standards and approaches, coordination of the program was easy, and the diversity of readings and methods used was an advantage. Now, with many of the instructors inexperienced and unfamiliar . . . with [our university], that diversity is becoming chaotic.

Although this quotation has a very local flavor about it, the concerns it expresses are not atypical. Most of the directors who cited the use of "part-time faculty" as a weakness in their programs saw that use as a cause of other problems. In particular, the directors frequently linked problems with "program coherence" to the use of part-time faculty, with several mentioning the difficulty of maintaining "program coherence" when new part-timers are hired for but one semester or academic year. It was interesting to us that virtually none of the directors associated the problems of part-time faculty with graduate teaching assistants in their programs. Perhaps the writing program directors have closer ties with and more control over that group of part-time faculty.

As Table X.2 illustrates, a number of other weaknesses or unsuccessful aspects of writing programs were also cited. Three of these--"inadequate remedial programs or courses," "getting students to the writing laboratory for help," and an "inadequate ESL program or course"--are probably all related inasmuch as all suggest the inability of the programs to deal effectively with the needs of underprepared or inadequately prepared students. When the percentages for these items are summed, we find that as many as 23.4% of the 94 directors may see these aspects as either weaknesses or unsuccessful components of their programs. The weaknesses of "remedial programs or courses" were most often

articulated in terms of the way such courses are taught. As one director from a public university wrote,

> The remedial course . . . seems far too dependent on grammar instruction, in my view, requiring only three 300-word essays (narration, description, comparison/contrast) plus a revision of each essay (that is, six "products" in fifteen weeks!)

Most of the directors who cited the "remedial course" as an unsuccessful aspect of their programs noted, as did the above director, the small number of writing assignments and the heavy emphasis on grammar. Another director saw the problems with remedial and ESL instruction as associated with larger programmatic issues:

> . . . The lack of adequate ESL and remedial programs (leading to great heterogeneity of students in the classroom) and the lack of any substantial coordination among teachers of all courses (leading to unequal standards and different curricula) work against rationality in our sequence.

As in this case, a fair number of the directors saw their ESL and remedial courses as contributing to a lack of "program coherence."

While still other weaknesses were mentioned by the directors, those we have illustrated were the ones most commonly cited. As with the directors' statements about the successful aspects of their programs, the statements we read and analyzed about the unsuccessful aspects were candid ones. They also are distributed across the categories of curricular, instructional, or administrative aspects of writing programs. While each of these categories are represented in the prose statements we read, we noted that there are generally fewer weaknesses or unsuccessful aspects associated with instruction than there were successful aspects. So too with unsuccessful curricular aspects of writing programs, although responses in this category appeared more frequently than did responses in the instructional category. The statements about the weaknesses or unsuccessful aspects of writing programs focused to a large extent on the administrative aspects of programs. In many cases, directors criticized their programs and often themselves for such weaknesses. However, several of the weaknesses we would classify as administrative ones seem to lie beyond the control of the directors themselves. For example, it does not seem that writing program directors can be held altogether responsible for the lack of commitment to the teaching of writing by tenured faculty in an English department or for the number of lower-division writing courses taught. While writing program directors may have a voice in such matters,

they themselves can often do little to change the situation. It is important to realize the impact that writing program weaknesses which lie beyond the control of the director have on directors. In many of the statements we read, we detected despair and frustration of the kind one director from a two-year college expressed so well:

> The Department is getting tired. We've all been teaching 101 for at least ten years . . . ; we've never had nay kind of in-service program or administrative encouragement to hold workshops, gather new ideas, etc.; and I think that some of our faculty feel a profound identification with Sisyphus--except that they can look forward to retirement and he can't.

Other directors offered innovative solutions to the contextual problems which writing program directors must face and deal with every day. One especially frustrated director said, for example, that the only solution to the administrative problems of his program was probably the "death or early retirement of influential tenured faculty members." Another argued that the entire administrative structure of the institution--from the president, to the academic vice-president, to the chief financial officer, to the basketball coach--had to be replaced with individuals who were committed to the development of writing skills among college students. Perhaps not all of the directors are so frustrated as was this individual, who announced to us his plan to resign and change professions at the end of the 1980-81 academic year. Yet the kind of frustration this director felt differed only in degree from that we found expressed in many of the statements.

CHAPTER XI

A CONCLUDING STATEMENT

At the outset of this report, we referred to the large number of rhetorical problems we encountered as we looked for ways of presenting the vast amounts of data we collected from the various institutions about their writing programs. We assumed that the report would be of some use to a number of different audiences, from teachers to writing program directors to top-level administrators. Accordingly, in the previous chapters we reported everything we were able to find out about the programs in our sample population.

If our sense of diverse audiences and audience needs affected the way we reported our findings, it must also affect the nature of the present chapter. Our own view of the importance of the findings and what they hold for the future of writing programs nationwide may differ substantially from the views of the various audiences. The present chapter is a cautious one, one that points to the limitations and the strengths of the survey we have reported and one that voices but one major conclusion.

A cautious concluding chapter filled with cautions about the survey itself is altogether appropriate. We have taken seriously the comments and advice of many directors regarding their uneasiness about our questionnaire itself. Although we present a number of statements below which illustrate these reservations, none perhaps expressed them better than the following one from a director of the writing program at a public university.

> As the director of a large program, I must, in part, go on faith as to what is occurring in the classroom. I hope that as much academic responsibility exists there as academic freedom. For this reason, I find my filling out parts of this questionnaire difficult. I don't know exactly what is occurring in many classes, especially those of the tenured staff. Student evaluations tell me some things, student complaints and praise tell me a bit more, talks with these people tell me a bit more--still the picture is fuzzy at best about a number of people who work in the program. Thus, I tried to read between and beyond the lines of this questionnaire; playing god is fun but troublesome. The questionnaire is mortal; so are the folks filling it out. Be careful, in your final report, not to deliver pronouncements about the state of the art. I would encourage you to be guarded.

This statement reflects the attitude with which we hope all the different audiences approach our report, and it states precisely one reason surveys such as the present one should be read with some caution. It also points to our reluctance to draw a series of major conclusions from our data.

XI. 1. CRITICISM OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Some of the directors who filled out our questionnaire and a few who simply returned it indicated that it contained a number of weaknesses. Comments about the questionnaire suggested that parts or all of it was poorly constructed and that it was either too detailed or not detailed enough.

Certainly not every director--in fact, less than 10 % of them--was highly critical of the questionnaire and the survey itself. Perhaps none of the directors was as openly critical as two from major state universities in different parts of the country. One of these directors voiced his frustration in filling out the questionnaire and offered some general advice on designing questionnaires:

> I undertook this task out of a sense of duty to the profession, and I filled out my form in the same spirit, although as my notations will suggest, I was extremely frustrated by the format, the details demanded in some places, and by the nature of many of the questions. . . . If you want to preserve a spirit of professional cooperation, please write questions and please create forms that take into account the shape of different institutions

The second director expressed a similar kind of frustration and offered much more specific advice on how we might have improved the questionnaire itself:

> I am ordinarily a cooperative and dogged filler-out of forms and questionnaires. This past year alone I count at least seven full length efforts, not all of which I considered very useful. And then I ran into yours. After a full 45 minutes on the first 13 pages of the "Directors" form, I was <u>angry</u>, irritated, and fed up. The form is busy, overloaded, and confusing. It's too long. Most of the time, it necessarily distorted the information I have to offer.

And he continued,

> I'm not going to rave on. I recommend, for further comment, that you send your form to someplace like the Center for Document Design in Washington. They'll at least tell you not to use two sides of a page and then staple so close to the corner that one can't get the thing open. What bothers me is that I would like, very much, to participate in a collection of information like this. We do need a profile of our profession's workplaces. . . . But I think your method is dead wrong. You want too much information from too many places too fast. Look: even if I filled this whole thing out, you wouldn't--couldn't--understand the nature of our program in any useful way. It would be leveled into a mishmash of inaccurate statistics, which would be further distorted by your analysis. Frankly, I think you've been sold a pseudo-social science bill of goods. Better you should conduct some careful case studies of representative institutions. Or hire a marketing firm to help you define your purpose more sharply, and establish more efficient sampling procedures.

Both of these directors make some useful comments and offer some legitimate criticisms of the questionnaire we designed. While there is no excuse for questions which are difficult to understand, such questions often do result when a questionnaire attempts to accommodate as many different kinds of writing programs as ours did and attempts to get at certain aspects of writing programs that permit something more than a superficial profile. Perhaps we attempted too much. Other criticisms, especially in the second extended comment, are somewhat more difficult to understand. We find it interesting that the second director quoted emphasizes the need for a "profile," which we take to mean something of a general picture of writing programs, and at the same time advocates "some careful case studies of representative institutions." How one is to make the connection between such "case studies" and a the more general "profile" remains unclear, since as far as we know generalizing from "case studies" to the larger population is extremely difficult and probably methodologically unsound. Then there is the problem of determining membership in the projected class of "representative institutions," a construct we sought to define operationally as we reviewed the literature on college writing programs. Unfortunately, the literature--which is largely anecdotal in nature and local in color--was of very little help. In fact, the absence of any operational definition of a "represenative institution" led us down the paths we chose. It is our hope that the preceeding chapters will allow other researchers to articulate what a "representative institution" with a "representative writing program" is. Perhaps our most outspoken critics are more knowledgeable of the literature in the area than we are.

While criticism such as that represented in the above quotations may suggest to some the general failure of our survey,

it seems to us that often the criticism is really directed toward more global matters than our survey and questionnaire, the latter perhaps providing an occasion for criticizing the profession at large:

> I started filling out the blanks but I got so fed up with it that I cannot continue. This is precisely what is wrong with teachers of composition and the humanities generally: it attempts to reduce to numbers, to "science" what is essentially an art. If you could get percentages and averages of all this stuff, what good would it be? So what?
>
> Teaching composition, writing, is <u>not</u> a social science and neither students nor teachers are numbers. This is altogether wrongheaded and I'll have nothing to do with it.
>
> The kinds of things that the NCTE and this silly questionnaire represent turn me off. Teacher College and the educationsits [sic] have won.
>
> Somebody is trying to feather his own nest, make himself a name, become a big gun, and he has the wrong model. Incidentally the directions are so develish hard to read, to figure out, that the makers of the questionnaire seem to need a course in composition themselves.

The amount of information elicited by our questionnaire was a source of much of the criticism leveled against it. One chairperson wrote that "As you may imagine, we came close to throwing the whole thing away because of the amount of time you have demanded for such a complex questionnaire." Another said essentially the same thing: "The length of the questionnaire is objectionable." Indeed, the amount of time required to complete the questionnaire was the most frequently criticized aspect of the survey, and it undoubtedly limited the number of completed questionnaires which were returned.

Another frequent criticism was the one voiced in both of the long quotations above, namely, that the questionnaire did not adequately accommodate the "shape of different institutions." Although we made considerable effort to do so, in the eyes of about 15 of the responding directors, we failed. Generally, this criticism was based on the director's belief that the questionnaire did not adequately focus on the diversity within particular programs. One director from a two-year college wrote that "Many of the questions were difficult to answer because we have great diversity in philosophy and strategies in writing instruction and few departmental guidelines." Another director from a public university commented that

> I have rarely felt so frustrated at a questionnaire--this one seemed totally at cross-purposes with the program I supervise. There seems to be no way of describing our (very simple!) program through the questions you ask; they seem to cut it into lengths for building a wholly different building.

Another director, this one from a private four-year institution, commented similarly:

> As is usual with such questionnaires, the most important items are ones that can't be anticipated precisely because they're new and creative. Programmes that fit questionnaires are mostly dead.

Another director from a private four-year school found similar problems with the questionnaire, but conceded that designing a questionnaire to accommodate different programs is probably difficult. She wrote,

> Because our program is emphatically cross-disciplinary and process-oriented, I had much difficulty with several of the categories. As you see, I found myself writing in the margin much of the time. No questionnaire, I suppose, can accommodate all atypical programs. I just wish that our approach would become typical!

Still another director, this one from a private university, thought the questionnaire imposed order where there was none:

> The questionnaire seems to presuppose much more structure in writing programs than I think exists in actuality. . . . Many institutions--certainly all the smaller ones and those, whatever their size, who do not have large numbers of graduate students in English--cannot require the degree of uniformity that some of your questions seem to expect. More space for "other" replies might have helped.

Such an array of critical comments might suggest that conducting our survey was an exercise in futility, yielding results which are neither valid nor reliable. Yet such negative comments were relatively few in number. And we contend that while the results of our survey should be interpreted with caution, the responses we did receive were generally good ones. Indeed, while the responding directors may have had to overcome certain obstacles in expression, in some of the categories we used, and in making their programs conform to the structure our

questionnaire imposed upon them, we are much impressed with the quality of the responses we received. And we have made every effort to treat those responses fairly and honestly. It is, however, the nature of surveys to level out some differences. It is also the nature of surveys to identify others. In reporting our findings we tried to consistently point out the differences, to accentuate the range of responses to the various questions we asked.

XI. 2. PRAISE OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Although we received a handful of negative comments about our survey and our questionnaire, we received many more positive ones, although many of them recognized the same limitations as our most outspoken critics did. Most of these positive comments indicated that (1) the responding directors are looking forward to seeing the present report and (2) they are looking forward to finding out how other institutions responded to many of the questions.

Many of these positive comments suggested that perhaps our questionnaire had made certain writing program directors consider various aspects of their programs they had never before thought about. One director from a private four-year college wrote,

> It was good to think about some of the questions asked and it will be interesting to see the results of the survey. Doing this survey has given me some questions to present to our faculty (Engl. Dept.) to stimulate discussion.

Another wrote,

> I'm glad that your survey came along when it did, since . . . [our school is doing a 3-year self-evaluation project, and this year it's our department's turn. You provided some good starters, ideas, questions. One reason that I'm returning this late is that we used your survey to take a departmental survey on certain questions.

Other directors commented in a similar vein, one from a private four-year institution remarking that "the questionnaire is a good catalyst for self-examination of the program and the director." From the associate director of writing programs at a large public university came the following statement:

> Thank you for asking us to participate. Because we're

> redesigning our freshman courses, we're already involved in close self-examination, and your survey forced us to collect data we need and to articulate our goals. We look forward now to receiving--and using--your summaries of the survey.

A director from a public four-year institution wrote that the questionnaire "made me aware that our writing program is like Topsy. We need to decide on program goals . . . so that all of us have definite goals in mind." Similarly, a director from one of the military academies suggested that simply completing the questionnaire was a useful activity. He wrote that

> The chief value of this questionnaire probably exists in making one responding to it think about the program he or she directs. Thanks for that opportunity. I shall look forward to seeing the tabulated results in the weeks ahead.

Statements such as these suggest that not only was the questionnaire a valid one for surveying college writing programs across the country, but also that the results we obtained are reliable ones. Such comments further suggest that the summaries appearing in the previous chapters will be of value to a substantial number of directors and institutions, and for a variety of different reasons. In these statements we also see a result we did not anticipate: a large number of directors seem to have examined certain aspects of their programs for the first time, and others seemed to have discovered aspects they did not know existed.

Although such statements as those quoted above suggest that our survey was indeed a successful one, we would be remiss if we did not include some statements that while generally positive also pointed to some negative aspects. From the director of a program at a four-year institution came the following response:

> Formidable! The <u>format</u> is imposing and some of the questions could have been clearer. I know how difficult a genre this is, however, and I'm grateful to you--and I'm sure the rest of us are as well--that the attempt to survey directors . . . is at least being made.

Another director, this one from a public university, was similarly sensitive to the difficulties of designing a questionnaire such as ours:

> It's long and I found that it did not always fit the complexities of our program. However, I tried to

> indicate what our program looks like by adding some detail. It is thorough, though, and made me find out information I wasn't aware of. . . . You should be commended . . . because such questionnaires are hell to design. I don't envy you.

Several directors indicated that they resented the time required to complete the questionnaire but believed the results would be worth the effort. Others noted that while the survey instrument was time-consuming and sometimes did not seem to do justice to their programs, a "questionnaire addressed to so many different kinds of writing programs probably couldn't have been constructed much differently." A fair number of directors indicated, as did a director from a private four-year school, that they "resented the quantitative orientation--numbers, numbers, numbers" but "otherwise

. . .

found it interesting and thought-provoking." Addressing the issue of quantification, a director from a public university wrote that

> On the whole, a provocative questionnaire. I'll be anxious to see the results. Like any questionnaire, however, it suffers from the fact that it's hard to assign numbers (even on a continuum) to something as "individualistic" as freshman composition!

Not uncommon were statements about the scope of the questionnaire, statements such as the following ones: "The questionnaire is more than adequate"; "You sure do seem to cover <u>everything</u>"; "The questionnaire is quite thorough." Typical of most of the comments from directors who saw both the strengths and the weaknesses of the questionnaire is the following statement from the director of a large writing program at a public university:

> The questionnaire is very thorough, perhaps too thorough in some places. It is very time-consuming. It is theory-based, for good or bad, depending on one's bias. It is capable of quantification, and that's good. It shows an awareness of recent trends and movements. It is generally clear with only occasional ambiguities.

Thus while our questionnaire might have been better than it was, the large number of positive comments we received suggests that it was well enough designed to serve its purpose.

XI. 3. ASPECTS OF WRITING PROGRAMS NOT COVERED BY THE PRESENT SURVEY

Not only did we receive positive and negative comments about the questionnaire from the responding directors, but we also received some suggestions for enlarging the scope of the survey. Most of these suggestions were of five types.

First, some directors suggested that the questionnaire might have been expanded to include more questions about how the various programs approach the teaching of writing process. Second, a few directors indicated the need for questions designed specifically for programs employing the cross-disciplinary approach to teaching writing at the undergraduate level. Third, some directors wrote that questions addressing specifically graduate-level offerings in composition and the teaching of writing might have yielded additional useful information. Fourth, some directors thought that some questions might have been included to indicate more precisely the nature of training programs for faculty who have recently had to take up the teaching of writing because of declining enrollments in literature courses. Fifth, some directors indicated that they wanted to see more questions about the positions writing directors hold, specifically questions having to do with salaries and with the amount of authority directors have to "run" the programs they direct.

We agree that most of these additional types of questions might have been included on our questionnaire. In fact, some of these types were represented in earlier versions. However, it is our belief that many such questions--for example, ones on cross-disciplinary writing programs--would have irritated more directors than they pleased. Perhaps the next time such a survey is undertaken such questions can be included. Other questions--such as ones focusing more specifically on the positions writing program directors hold--are, we believe, better asked by organizations to which writing program directors belong. Still other questions--such as those which could focus on retraining literature faculty--are also better left to recognized professional organizations such as the Association of Departments of English or the Modern Language Association.

All of the suggestions we received for expanding the survey we conducted were good ones, and we would like to see those questions answered.

XI. 4. A MAJOR CONCLUSION

In one sense, the previous sections of the present chapter have all to one degree or another suggested the limitations of

the present study. We will not again rehearse them here. But whatever its limitations, the survey did show a great deal of diversity among the programs both across institutional types and within institutional types. Throughout the preceding chapters of this report we have tried to call attention to this diversity--by calling attention to ranges in the response categories, by pointing to large standard deviations and variances for different responses. And if there is to be drawn a major conclusion from our examination of the writing programs we surveyed, it is that they are generally very different from one another, that they are each designed to address primarily the local needs of the institution, the department, and the student body. The director who noted in rather harsh language that descriptive statistics tend to level out such differences is correct if the only statistics reported are means or averages. Yet people often tend to look at averages or means and forget such statistics as standard deviations and variances. Thus in the pages which follow, we would like to illustrate the diversity of the programs we surveyed, to direct attention away from means and averages toward individual programs.

One major contributor to the diversity we saw among the programs we surveyed was transition, transition from a program guided by one set of goals or philosophy to a program guided by a different set of goals or philosophy. Although several directors commented that their programs were undergoing changes, the nature of such transitions was probably best expressed by a director from a rather small institution:

> Two years ago, we organized a quarter-long faculty in-service workshop, "Teaching College Writing." This course exposed faculty to the writing and research of Ross Winterowd, Janet Emig, E.D. Hirsch, Mina Shaughnessy, Gary Tate, Richard Young, Ken Macrorie, and Peter Elbow. As a result of this experience, at least 2/3 of the full-time faculty have revised their approach to freshman composition and remedial writing with these areas of new emphasis: More personal writing, more in-class writing, more work on audience analysis, more emphasis on pre-writing and re-writing, more use of sentence combining. The common ground established through the workshop has allowed faculty to continue to exchange ideas on methods and materials they are currently using/developing.

Many directors wrote similar statements which focused on the ever-changing nature of writing instruction as faculty in their programs became aware of new ideas and tried to incorporate what they had learned into their teaching. Of course, not all directors indicated that their programs are undergoing change; but in those institutions where the writing programs are changing, there may well exist considerable diversity in the way writing is taught.

Another frequently cited source of this diversity across institutions was the nature of the student population served. Several directors indicated that they have constantly had to accommodate different kinds of students as incoming abilities decline or as the school opens its doors to different kinds of students. One director from a technical four-year institution perhaps best indicated how the student population the program is designed to serve affects the nature of the program itself. He wrote that,

> Our program may find its strength . . . in its ability to intertwine increasing amounts of consideration of the writing needs of scientists and engineers. Because virtually all of our students, both ESL and native speakers, are future scientists or engineers, focusing on their future writing needs is simpler than it would be in a liberal arts environment, where students plan to head in many directions and some have no plans as yet. The flip side of that, however, is that writing is harder to establish across the curriculum than it is in liberal arts colleges, since our faculty have never integrated writing into their courses the way liberal arts faculty have done. For engineers, the research paper never existed; it has not been abandoned.

In this particular case the institutional contraints that operate on the program are apparent, but more important is that the institution apparently values writing for its student population somewhat less than would other institutions.

Diversity in writing programs across types of institutions is also reflected in the curricula the various programs teach. While it is impossible to illustrate the full range of curricula which underlie the programs we surveyed, a couple statements may help to suggest the range of different programs. The director from one four-year institution described the relationship between his program's curriculum and the goals of the program in the following way:

> Our emphasis on rhetorical theory, especially in our first course, has given students a useful focus for all their writing and other communications. The classical rhetorical focus of content, audience, and persona has made our students better readers, better writers, and better oral communicators. This approach also allows students to critique organization and style. It has also contributed to the liberal arts component of their education.

In other programs, the teaching of rhetoric and rhetorical principles appears to complement or supplement the teaching of

content in the sense of a body of knowledge to be used rather than content in sense of principles to be used and processes applied. Such is the case at a public university, whose director of writing wrote that

> Our second required composition course . . . is divided into different thematic units (we call them "modules"). These unit have reading requirements that differ. [These classes] . . . have the same writing requirements in terms of length of papers, number of papers, and kinds of papers. . . . The subject matter differs from module to module to offer students some choice about the general topic. We have modules dealing with the changing roles of men and women, technology, death and dying, film, and several with a literary focus: introduction to literature, mythology, heroes, and short fiction. These choices, students say, are worth the effort put forth by the Department to maintain them.

Statements such as these suggest that writing curricula differ considerably across institutions. Indeed, our reading of the many comments the responding directors made in the margins of our questionnaire and of the many statements about their writing programs and courses suggests to us that few members of our profession would or could agree on a common definition or description of a writing curriculum for any course. The diversity of writing curricula was probably the source of more criticism of our questionnaire than anything else. Most directors tend to view their curricula as the best of all possible curricula. Given specific institutional contexts, these directors may be correct.

Another aspect of diversity is instruction. And we perhaps encountered as many different ways of teaching writing as institutions we surveyed. We have, however, chosen but three statements to illustrate this instructional variety. The first statement comes from the director of a writing program at a community college. That director wrote,

> Our program's goal is effective student writing. There are two aspects that are important in reaching that goal: (1) emphasis on individual instruction, the one-to-one method promoted by Roger Garrison; and (2) use, as a supplement, of collaborative learning in composition classes, for instance, the group study exercise in Thom Hawkins' Group Inquiry Techniques for Teaching Writing for peer evaluation.

From another director in a two-year college came a very different perspective on instructional methods. Using the first person, this director offered the following description:

> There are two aspects which have proven most successful in my teaching of our first-term freshman writing course. First, I have students do a very extensive outline, so complete that it is virtually a draft. In it, they limit their subject, define their audience and purpose, state each of their main ideas in complete sentences and jot down all of their supporting detail. This enables--indeed forces--them to think through their subject, to carefully select and develop each idea before they commit themselves to including it in their essay, and then to arrange those ideas in a logical sequence. By fully planning the content of their papers before they write a draft, students can start writing their drafts confident that they can cover the subject, knowing what they wish to say, in what order, etc. They are then free, in writing the draft, to concentrate on composing--on word choice, sentence structure, spelling, grammar, diction, paragraphing, etc.
>
> Second, I use a combination of transformational grammar and generative rhetoric (as recommended by Francis Christensen) in working with sentences and paragraphs. This gives students, often for the first time, real control over their sentences.

At the opposite extreme from directors who advocated rather specific and detailed methods of instruction were those who were skeptical that any one method is to be prefered over another. A director from a private university offered the following statement, which is something of a justification for the great amount of diversity in instructional methods in his program.

> . . . the relative freedom each instructor has in organizing the work in Freshman English can be a great advantage. Each section is different, with different needs, different interests. Instructors are free to adapt the work to the particular students--perhaps a section with several foreign students, or one with several drama majors, or one with a high proportion of transfers, and so on. . . . This advantage can be a serious disadvantage if the instructor is not inventive and knowledgeable.
>
> Our chief goal is the obvious one--to increase our students' ability to express themselves clearly and accurately in expository prose. Has anybody devised an ideal way to do this with a group of students? Surely, each group requires different methods, and each individual student requires adaptations by the instructor. The important ingredient is the instructor--his/her willingness to spend a lot of time in conferences, to get to know each student individually, to encourage and read and respond intelligently to the

students' writing. The instructors with the interest and patience and basic knowledge of good writing all do excellent work whatever their particular methods, and their students improve.

There is perhaps no more appropriate an ending for this report than the above statement. For while in the preceeding chapters we have focused on the "general" nature of college writing programs, on constructing a "profile" that reaches across institutional boundaries, the specific ways in which each of us succeeds in helping students become better writers is finally the most important aspect of what we do.

NOTES

1

The authors wish to thank James L. Kinneavy (Project Director), Richard L. Larson and Richard Lloyd-Jones (Project Consultants), Chris Benton Bovey and Rebecca Francis (Project Secretaries), Anna Skinner, Torrance Banks, and Ray Cook (Research Associates), and Janice Sturrock and Kimberly Reynolds (Student Assistants) for their help in designing the survey instrument, collecting responses, and putting the data in computer-readable form. We are especially grateful to Jim Kinneavy for his comments on parts of the report as it was being written and for his help in interpreting some of the data and to Anna Skinner, Roger Cherry, and Maxine Hairston for suggesting improvements in wording.

2

Jasper Neel, Options for the Teaching of English: Freshman Composition (Boston, MA: Modern Language Association, 1978).

3

Harvey Wiener and Eliane Maimon (eds.), "Comprehensive Writing Programs," Forum for Liberal Education, 3, no. 6 (April, 1981).

4

Themes, Theories, and Therapy: The Teaching of Writing in College (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963).

5

Elizabeth Cowan, ed., Options for the Teaching of English (New York: Modern Language Association, 1975).

6

Jasper Neel, Options for the Teaching of English: Freshman Composition (Boston, MA: Modern Language Association, 1978.)

7

Claude Gibson, "Business as Usual: Write, Write, Write," The CEA Forum (October, 1978), pp. 3-9.

8

A list of the persons completing the writing program directors survey appears in Appendix A. Most of the respondents are "writing program directors"; a few, however, are departmental chairpersons and a few are faculty whom chairpersons asked to complete our questionnaire. For the sake of economy in expression, we have taken the liberty throughout the report of calling all respondents "writing program directors."

9

In Chapter XI we have included a number of the comments, both positive and negative, that directors made about our survey in general and about our questionnaire in particular.

10

Among the responding institutions were the United States Military Academy and the United States Air Force Academy, both of which receive their funding from the federal government.

11

The information about the source of funding for the institutions whose writing program directors responded to the survey is based on the following sources: David B. Biesel, et al., eds., The College Blue Book: Narrative Description, 17th ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1979); Susan F. Watts and Joan Hunter, eds., Peterson's Annual Guide to Undergraduate Study, 1980 Edition (Princeton, NJ: Perterson's Guides, 1979); James Cass and

Max Birnbaum, Comparative Guide to American Colleges, 9th ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1979); and Maureen Matheson, ed., The College Handbook, 1980-81 (New York: College Examination Board, 1980). The data reported in Table I-2 on primary means of

support for colleges and universities nationwide comes from Nancy B. Dearman, The Condition of Education: Statistical Report (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1980), and W. Vance Grant and Leo J. Eiden, Digest of Education Statistics (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1980).

12 See Education Directory: Colleges and Universities, 1978-1979 (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1980). The way we have classified the schools responding to our questionnaire differs from the way Gibson, "Business as Usual," classified his. If we judge by the number of universities (229) cited in Gibson's report, it would appear that school names ("university," "college," "junior college,") determined membership in Gibson's classes.

13 It should be pointed out, however, that we did complete several preliminary analyses in which the institutions were classified strictly by their names. Unfortunately, this simpler method of classifying the institutions blurred considerably distinctions between four-year institutions and universities. We thus felt compelled to use the NCES's taxonomy in classifying our data.

14 These categories are adapted from those used by the NCES; see especially, Grant and Eidon, Digest of Education Statistics.

15 Information on the staffing of writing classes with graduate students is presented in a subsequent section.

16 It is interesting to note that when the writing program directors we surveyed were asked to identify, for a national survey of colleges teachers of writing, the two best teachers in their programs, a large number identified graduate-student teachers.

17 See in particular, A Theory of Discourse (1971; rpt. New York: W.W. Norton, 1980).

18 See A Conceptual Theory of Rhetoric (Cambridge, MA: Winthrop, 1975).

19 See James L. Kinneavy, J.Q. Cope, and J.W. Campbell, Writing--Basic Modes of Organization (Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt, 1976).

20 The analyses of the prose statements began with one of the investigators reading 30 of the statements about the most successful aspects and 30 of the statements about the least successful. This subsample contained an equal number of responses from private and public schools and from four-year institutions and universities. Because so few two-year colleges responded to our survey, only two such schools, both public, were represented in the 30-institution subsample. As these prose statements were read, each "most successful" and each "least successful" aspect named was listed. After the responses from all 30 institutions were so analyzed, a composite list of items for each question was constructed. In order for an item to appear on these composite lists, it had to appear on at least two of the 30 directors' statements. Fifteen items appeared on the resultant list of "most successful aspects," and 13 items

appeared on the resultant list of "least successful aspects." These lists became the bases for coding all responses. The actual coding sheets used contained not only the items listed, but also spaces for at least 15 additional items. Four coders used these sheets to code the directors' statements for content. Each statement was read by at least two persons and differences in coding the various statements were resolved on the spot. Subsequently, each coding sheet and each statement were reviewed side-by-side by the principal author as a check on the previous codings and to insure that all responses not included on the lists were added to the coding sheets. Subsequently, added items which appeared more than three times were coded for keypunching. The result of these procedures was that 20 items were keypunched for the "most successful" aspects of the represented writing programs, and 15 items were keypunched for the "least successful" aspects.

APPENDIX:

UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

Anna Maria College

Asnuntock Community College

Auburn University

Augsburg College

Baruch College

Beaver College

Boston University

Brigham Young University

California State University--Dominguez Hills

Carnigie-Mellon University

Case Western Reserve University

Central Conneticut State College

Central Oregon Community College

The City College of New York

City University of New York--York College

Clarke College

College of Mount St. Vincent

College of St. Catherine

College of St. Francis

College of William and Mary

Cook-Douglass College Writing Center

Dean Junior College

De Anza College

Delta College

Drexel University
Eastern Central University

Eastern Michigan University

Edison Community College

El Centro College

Franklin and Marshall College

Frostburg State College

Furrum College

Hofstra University

Hunter College

Indiana State University--Evansville

Indiana University

Jefferson Community College

Kansas State University

Lake Forest College

Lenoir-Rhyne College

Lewis and Clark Community College

Los Angeles Trade Technical College

Louisiana State University

Loyola Marymount University

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Miami (Ohio) University

Michigan Technological University

Middle Tennessee State University

Monroe Community College

Murray State College

New York City Technical College

Nicholls State University

Northwest Nazarene College

Ohio Dominican College

Ohio University

Ohio Wesleyan University

Oklahoma University

Pennsylvania State--Behrend College

Pennsylvania State--College Park

Pepperdine University

Polytechnic Institute of New York

Princeton University

Principia College

Queens College

Robert Morris College

Rochester Institute of Technology

Rutgers University--Camden College

Rutgers University--Livingston College

St. Edward's University

St. Paul's College

St. Peter's College

St. Thomas University

San Francisco State University

J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College

Southwestern Oklahoma State University

Spokane Falls Community College

State University of New York at Albany

State University of New York at Oneonta

Syracuse University

Texas A&M University

Texas Christian University

Texas Tech University

Tougaloo College

Tulane University

United States Air Force Academy

United States Military Academy

University at St. Louis

University of Alabama

University of California at Davis

University of California at Los Angeles

University of Cincinnati

University of Colorado

University of Georgia

University of Hartford

University of Houston

University of Illinois--Urbana

University of Iowa

University of Kentucky

University of Louisville

University of Michigan

University of Minnisota--Deluth

University of Nebraska--Lincoln

University of Nevada--Las Vegas

University of New Mexico

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

University of North Carolina at Wilmington

University of Pittsburgh at Johnstown

University of Pittsburgh

University of South Alabama

University of Southern Mississippi

University of South Florida--Tampa

University ofTampa

University of Texas--Austin

University of Virginia--Charlottesville

University of Washington

University of Wisconsin

Upsala College

Virginia Tech

Walla Walla College

West Liberty State College

Wichita State University

Wilberforce University

William Jewell College

William Paterson College

Youngstown State University